VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

BISHOP FALLON REPLIES.

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

After squirming for six weeks Canon Tucker finally admits that the charge he leveled against Catholics in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 3rd of February last was idolatry. For mariolatry and idolatry are synonymous terms. Being a gentleman, of course it hurts Canon Tucker to use the word "if it be offensive"; but as a dignitary of the Anglican Church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, he must instruct his congregation, and "it would seem that mariolatry is not too strong a word "to impart such instruction." Too polite to libel an individual Catholic, yet Canon Tucker does not consider it bad manners to slander them in bulk. And to justify his weird notion of "instruction," he invokes the principle of freedom of speech. "If," asks Canon Tucker, "a minister of religion is not free to instruct his congregation on religious matters, where, then, is freedom of speech, of teaching or of worship?" The obligation not to bear false witness is, to say the least, as sacred as the principle of freedom of speech. That obligation Canon Tucker has shamelessly violated.

Now that Canon Tucker has accused Catholics of being idolators, let us examine the basis upon which he rests so foul a charge. His first argument is drawn from a book, "Manual of Romanish Controversy," by the Rev. R. P. Blakeney, a Protestant minister, whom Canon Tucker canonizes as "an accurate and serious author." Dr. Blakeney quotes from a "Psalter of Mary," by St. Bonaventure. The British Musoum catalogue, an authority that even Canon Tucker will scarcely question, characterizes this alleged "Psalter of Mary" as "spurious." Your readers may choose between Canon Tucker on the one hand and the British Museum catalogue on the other.

In his dash to South America Canon Tucker is still more unfortunate. In this case his faithful navigator is another Protestant minister, the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom he vouches for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world today." Permit me to throw a little light on the reliability of this "outstanding figure."

On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati on "Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America." This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N. Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American Continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela and an encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. to the clergy of Chile. It took more than two years to force the Rev. Robert E. Speer to acknowledge that the documents he had used were forgeries. On October 18, 1910, this "outstanding figure in the religious world" was informed that Rome had pronounced the encyclical in question "a palpable fraud and forgery," and that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral "a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." It was only on the 30th of April, 1912, that the Rev. Robert E. Speer, in a letter over his own signature, admitted the forgery. He made no apology for his unspeakable offence, but with a callous disregard for decency expressed his pleasure that "the matter has been definitely settled, not only by the statement of the secretary of the archbishop, but also by the acknowledgment on the part of the original inventor." Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent.

Thus the latest charge of mariolatry against Catholics rests on the authority of the Rev. W. P. Blakeney, who makes use of a "spurious" work; of the Rev. Robert E. Speer, a circulator of "a palpable forgery, a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud"—and of the Rev. L. Norman Tucker, canon of the Anglican Church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral.

An equally indefensible and similarly baseless falsehood was exposed some years ago by the late Cardinal Newman. On that occasion the culprit was also a minister of the Church of England. He had been on a visit to Belgium, and on his return made the following declaration, which was reported in the London Times in June, 1851: "On my visit to Brussels I was led to inspect the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral. I saw fastened up there a catalogue of sins, with a specification of the prices at which remission of each might severally be obtained." On investigation it was found that there was indeed a catalogue fastened to the door of St Gudule's Cathedral. The inscription, translated, ran as follows: "A chair without cushion, one cent; a chair with cushion, two cents. On great festival days, a chair without cushion, two cents; a chair with cushion, four cents."

It is not on record that either the London Times or the Anglican minister made an apology. It looks as though Canon Tucker was running true to form.

M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

"P. S.—Would it be an indiscretion to request the anonymous letter-writers "Onlooker" and "Bystander" to reveal their real identity? Their style and matter arouse my curiosity and suspicion.

London, March 20, 1919.

In Northern ales

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

BISHOP FALLON'S FINAL REPLY,

To The Editor of the Advertiser:

It is not my fault if Canon Tucker, in following his friends Dr. Blakeney and the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, digged a pit into which his own feet have stumbled. A man who rests his case on such authorities must abide by the consequences. I realize that the canon's position is humiliating; but it is not of my making. I am not responsible for his pawn-shop scholarship; but if it relieves his feelings, I have no serious objection to be the target of so angry and flustered a marksman whose weapons are so antiquated and so obsolete. The canon is now engaged, to use an expressive Americanism, in "shooting up the whole landscape" from Boston to Brazil, in the hope of inflicting some damage, somehow, somewhere, on Catholics. Even without the evidence of his last letters, it would be an easy guess that the canon was perturbed. To be caught in the company of either the "spurious" Blakeney or of that common peddler of "palpable forgery and coarse fraud," the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, would in itself be sufficiently disconcerting; but to be detected consorting with both

of them at once might well make even a less sensitive controversialist than the canon feel uncomfortable and unclean. But Canon Tucker has himself, and himself only, to blame. He should have profited by the wisdom of my philosophic fellow-idolater, Artemus Ward: "It is not so much the things we don't know that make us ridiculous, as knowing so many things that ain't so." Samuel Pickwick, Esq., president of the Pickwick Club, enjoyed a bubble reputation as an antiquarian until it was shown that the cryptic inscription on his famous discovery was simply "Bill Stumps, His Mark."

Canon Tucker is no mean rival of Mr. Pickwick, as the facts establish. On February 16th Canon Tucker said, on the authority of Dr. Blakeney: "St. Bonaventure, called the seraphic doctor, published a Psalter of the Virgin." At that time Dr. Blakeney was, in the words of Canon Tucker, "an eminent theologian." Later on he was styled "an accurate and serious writer." But the eminence, accuracy and seriousness of Dr. Blakeney were knocked into the proverbial cocked hat when it became known that the British Museum Catalogue described the work cited by him as "spurious."

On St. Patrick's day, happy omen! with a flourish of trumpets Canon Tucker paraded on the local stage another of his favorites. This time it was the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, whom the canon vouched for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world today." Speer's speciality was the vilification of the Catholics of the whole South American Continent—no small undertaking; and, incidentally, the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods—an easier and more profitable operation. But Speer's reliability was seriously impaired when it was disclosed that he had offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII. and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago. It was not an enviable position for this "outstanding figure in the religious world," nor for his London sponsor. Canon Tucker now unblushingly admits that the documents were forgeries, but declares that Dr. Speer used them "in all good faith, thinking they were genuine." To be sure! Such is the defence of every slander-hawker when he is found out. But the point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin of Cleveland who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries. With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name; "At his request I keep his name secret." He even went the length of intensifying his offence and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies. "The author of the Letter" (that is, the forger) "claims that the statements are all true, even today." It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct.

And such are Canon Tucker's authorities! Oh! Geordie, jingling Geordie, it is grand to hear "spurious" Blakeney laying down the guilt of Catholic Idolatry, and "good faith" Speer lecturing on the turpitude of South Americans, and all the while Canon Tucker waves his hat from the wings.

Canon Tucker declares that I have admitted that "there is such a book as the Psalter of the Virgin". That assertion, like so many others of Canon Tucker, is at direct variance with the facts, I have not at any time either admitted or denied the existence of "the Psalter of the Virgin." I know nothing of it; I have never seen it; I have failed in my search for it. It may exist. It may have been written by Titus Oates, or Dr. Blakeney, or Maria Monk, or the Rev. Robt. E Speer, or Horatio Hocken, or Canon Tucker. But, used as it has been by the Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, it is "spurious." And that is as a somewhat damaging fact.

But I have come across a Psalter that has aroused my curiosity. It is to be found in Canon Tucker's own "Book of Common Prayer," in a service appointed in the Church of England for June 20th, the anniversary of the accession of the late Queen Victoria. In that service the name of the Queen is substituted in more than half a dozen psalms. Thus it would seem that what is quite appropriate in the case of the Queen of England becomes rank idolatry when applied to the Queen of Heaven!

Canon Tucker's horror suffocates him as he writes of Catholic "worship" of the Blessed Virgin Mary. What of the foul idolatry approved by the "Book of Common Prayer" when, in the marriage service, it directs the husband to say to the wife: "With my body I thee worship?"

Canon Tucker is shocked to the innermost fibre of his spiritual being by some of the terms of devotion which he declares Catholics address to the Virgin Mary. What will he say of the dedication of the Approved Protestant Version of the Bible, wherein Queen Elizabeth is styled "that bright Occidental Star," where King James is likened to the Sun and is described as "that Sanctified Person, who, under God, is the immediate author of all their (his subjects) true happiness?"

And now I beg leave to bid a definite, if not very respectful, farewell to Canon Tucker and his blind, blundering guides, Blakeney and Speer. In doing so I desire to express the conviction that many devout Anglicans, who love the Mother of God and pray to her, will not thank Canon Tucker for his attempt to throw obloquy upon that devotion. Nor are they apt to follow him in his unjustifiable accusation that Catholics are idolaters. Rather will they approve the words of Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves repudiate."

And it is Sydney Smith who wrote: "The more dirt, the less hurt."

†M. F. Fallon,
Bishop of London.

London, April 1, 1919.

TWO KILLED IN EXPLOSION.

Paterson, N. J., April 2.—Two men were reported killed today in an explosion which destroyed two of the twenty mills which comprise the Du-Pont powder works at Wayne. The shock was felt in territory four miles around.

THE FREE PRESS, LONDON, ONTARIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1919.

BISHOP FALLON TO CANON TUCKER.

Editor, Free Press. After squirming for six weeks Canon Tucker finally admits that the charge he leveled against Catholics in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 3rd of February last, was idolatry. For mariolatry and idolatry are synonymous terms. Being a gentleman, of course, it hurts Canon Tucker to use the word "if it be offensive," but as a dignitary of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, he must instruct his congregation, and "it would seem that mariolatry is not too strong a word" to impart such instruction. Too polite to libel an individual Catholic, yet Canon Tucker does not consider it bad manners to slander them in bulk. And to justify his wierd notion of "instruction," he invokes the principle of freedom of speech. "If," asks Canon Tucker "a minister of religion is not free to instruct his congregation on religious matters, where then is freedom of speech, of teaching or of worship?" The obligation not to bear false witness is, to say the least, as sacred as the principle of freedom of speech. That obligation Canon Tucker has shamelessly violated.

Now, Canon Tucker has accused Catholics of being idolators, let us examine the basis upon which he rests so foul a charge. His first argument is drawn from a book, "Manual of Romanish Controversy," by Rev. R. P. Blakeney, a Protestant minister, whom Canon Tucker canonizes as "an accurate and serious author." Dr. Blakeney quotes from a "Psalter of Mary," by St. Bonaventure. The British Museum Catalogue, an anthority that even Canon Tucker will scarcely question, characterizes this alleged "Psalter of Mary" as "spurious." Your readers may choose between Canon Tucker on the one hand and the British Museum Catalogue on the other.

In his dash to South America Canon Tucker is still more unfortunate. In this case his faithful navigator is again another Protestant minister, the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom he vouches for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world to-day." Permit me to throw a little light on the reliability of this "outstanding figure."

On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on "Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethern of South America." This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester N. Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefore a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIIII., to the clergy of Chile. It took more than two years to force the Rev. Robert E. Speer to acknowledge that the documents he had used were forgeries. On October 18, 1910, this outstanding figure in the religious world" was informed that Rome had pronounced the Encyclical in question "a palpable fraud and forgery," and that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral "a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." It was only on the 30th of April, 1912, that Rev. Robert E. Speer, in a letter over his own signature, admitted the forgery. He made no apology for his unspeakable offense, but with a callous disregard for decency, expresed his pleasure that "the matter had been definitely settled, not only by the statement of the secretary of the archbishop, but also by the acknowledgment of the part of the original inventor." Meanwhile the vile calunmy had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent.

Thus the latest charge of mariolatry against Catholics rests on the authority of the Rev. W. P. Blakeney, who makes use of a "spurious" work; of the Rev. Robert E. Speer, a circulator of "a palpable forgery, a wicked and vile calunmy, a coarse fraud," and of the Rev. L. Norman Tucker, canon of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral.

An equally indefensible and similarly baseless falsehood was exposed some years ago by the late Cardinal Newman. On that occasion the culprit was also a minister of the Church of England. He had been on a visit to Belgium, and, on his return, made the following declaration which was reported in the London Times in June, 1851: "On my visit to Brussels I was led to inspect the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral; I saw fastened up there a catalogue of sins, with a specification of the prices at which remission of each might severally be obtained." On investigation it was found that there was indeed a catalogue fastened to the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral. The inscription translated ran as follows: 'A chair without cushion, one cent; a chair with cushion, two cents. On great festival days, a chair without cushion, two cents; a chair with cushion, four cents.'

It is not on record that either the London Times or the Anglican minister made an apology. It looks as though Canon Tucker was running true to form.

M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

P. S.—Would it be an indiscretion to request the anonymous letter writers "Onlooker," and "Bystander" to reveal their real identity? Their style and matter arouse my curiosity and suspicion.

London, March 20, 1919.

March 31, 1919

LONDON ADVERTISER, LONDON,

DR. TUCKER TO BISHOP FALLON.

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

A layman of Chile, presumbaly a Roman Catholic, forged a long letter purporting to be addressed to Pope Leo XIII., to the prelates of Chile, containing a terrible arraignment of the archbishop and clergy of the country. This letter was published October 24, 1897, in one of the ablest newspapers in the land. On December 5, 1897, the same paper published what purported to be the archbishop's reply, issued under his seal. Extracts from these letters were published in magazines in Germany, England and the United States, and a paragraph from the alleged letter of the pope was printed in half a dozen different books. And yet these seem never to have been called in question. On a visit to South America, Dr. Speer came across these publications, and in all good faith, thinking they were genuine, quoted from them on his return, at a conference held in Rochester in 1909. They were at once challenged and Dr. Speer instituted a thorough investigation. After a search, extending over more than one year he not only ascertained that they were false, but succeeded in unearthing the culprit, who merely laughed at the matter as a huge joke. Dr. Speer then published the result of his investigations, and expressed regret for the part he had taken in the matter. This is the sum and substance of the incident that has won for Dr. Speer the gracious and delicate attentions of Bishop Fallon.

The bishop has indeed no cause to think too kindly of Dr. Speer for he has drawn a most shocking picture of the moral conditions of South Amcrica. He gladly acknowledges the many winning qualities and artistic tastes of the people, and predicts a great future for

the country, if the evils that are sapping its strength are eradicated. He cannot absolve the Roman Catholic from all blame in the matter, for it is practically the only religious institution in the land, and has held undisputed sway for 300 years. In the matter of education, while great progress is being made, the rank and file of the people are illiterate. In morals the country is rotten to the core, one main source of the corruption being the priesthood itself. The church is resolutely opposed to freedom of worship, and is reported by Professor Monte Verde, of the University of Uraguay, as preferring clubs of infidels to Protestant churches. It is equally opposed to civil marriage, and as a result there are whole towns in certain districts where there is not nor has there ever been a marriage. A large proportion of the children are illegitimate. And as to religion Brazil has no longer any faith; statesmen, lawyers, physicians, army and navy officials have, almost to a man, turned to infidelity. Porto Rico is a Roman Catholic country without religion; only satire would call Central America Christian. No wonder that Dr. Speer is a witness who must be discredited at all costs. But Dr. Speer quotes a vast mass of evidence from the tongue and pen of priests, authors, travelers, professors and representatives of the American Government, and only in the case of these forged letters has his testimony been shaken.

Now, to the ordinary mortal it would seem that the real culprit is the forger and not Dr. Speer, who was deceived by the forgery. Why does Bishop Fallon use his bludgeon on Dr. Speer and let the real culprit go scot free? Can it be the guilty consciousness that the papal power is too much indebted to successful forgery to allow him to cudgel his best friends?

At the close of the eighth century an advocate of the papal power forged two sets of documents, which he ascribed to Isidore, of Seville, as the Psalter of the Virgin was ascribed to Bonaventure. The one was the donation of Constantine and was introduced to the world by Pope Adrian the first, who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality of the great Constantine. This has become one of the main pillars of the temporal power of the pope. The other was the false decretals, one of the mighiest engines in the triumph of the papacy, which consisted of 59 false letters and decrees of the 20 oldest popes and 39 false decrees and acts of several unauthentic councils. It is impossible to deny that the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud which for 60 years imposed on the ignorance and credulity of the world. Gibbon calls them the two magic pillars of the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the popes. They aided in raising the spiritual above the temporal power, in removing clerics from the jurisdiction of secular courts and in securing to the bishops of Rome a supremacy over all other bishops. They effectually broke down all opposition, secular and religious, and, in the end, helped to create the dogma of the infallibility of the pope.

The result may be seen in the extraordinary power wielded by the popes in the middle ages. The Kingdom of England was placed under an interdict, subjects were absolved from their allegiance to their sovereign, the king was personally excommunicated and finally was deposed and King John, after several years of resistance, was reduced to the necessity of resigning his crown to the papal legate and of receiving it back as a vassal of the pope. The haughty and powerful Philip Augustus, King of France, was humbled in like manner, and King Henry, of Germany, was compelled to go to Canosa. In a dreary winter season, with the ground deep in snow, with every mark of royalty laid aside, barefooted, clad only in the long white linen dress of the penitent, he waited three days at the door of the castle before the pope would condescend to restore to him his crown. One of the main buttresses of that almost unlimited power were these forged documents, because they silenced all opposition by seeming to carry back that usurped authority to the earliest ages of the church.

Bishop Fallon is reported by The Boston Herald to have said at a missionary congress: "What does this movement mean? It means that we propose to make this continent Catholic." This, perhaps, explains his arrogant claim to pose as censor of the pulpits of the city. He may look to time-serving politicians to kow-tow to him, but not to ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It may also explain his piteous wail, "Why do they not leave us alone?" as if he meant to spend the rest of his days in rapt meditation on the glories of Mary, in a quietude like that of a Trappist monastry. And, in the same breath, he announces a series of Lenten controversial sermons, in which he assails Protestantism in general, and Luther, Knox and Henry VIII. in particular. It reminds one of the gentle German hacking his way through Belgium, whining all the way because he is driven to withstand the unprovoked attacks of England and France.

To make this continent Roman Catholic means something. It may mean to reduce it to the low level of South America in education, in morals and in religion. And, as Rome is always the same—semper eadem—Bishop Fallon may look wistfully to the time when the pope may be able to place the dominions of the King of England under an interdict and compel the President of the United States to go to Canosa. With all the lessons of history before us, if we play into his hands, as so many are only too ready to do, we shall richly deserve our fate.

I must leave to the Church of Rome the pitiful distinction of having perpetrated "the greatest aberration in the history of Christendom" and the greatest fraud and imposture in the history of the world.

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, March 28, 1919.

BISHOP FALLON BIDS FAREWELL TO CANON TUCKER.

Editor of The Free Press: It is not my fault if Canon Tucker, in following his friends Dr. Blakeney and the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, digged a pit into which his own feet have stumbled. A man who rests his ease on such authorities must abide by the consequences. I realize that the canon's position is humiliating; but it is not of my making. I am not responsible for his pawnshop scholarship; but, if it relieves his feelings, I have no serious objection to be the target of so angry and flustered a marksman whose weapons are so antiquated and so obsolete. The canon is now engaged, to use an expressive Americanism, in "shooting up the whole landscape" from Boston to Brazil, in the hope of inflicting some damage, somehow, somewhere, on Catholics. Even without the evidence of his last letters, it would be an easy guess that the canon was perturbed. To be caught in the company of either the "spurious" Blakeney or of that common peddler of "palpable forgery and coarse fraud," the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, would in itself be sufficiently disconcerting; but to be detected consorting with both of them at once might well make even a less sensitive controversialist that the canon feel uncomfortable and unclean. He should have profited by the wisdom of my philosphio fellow-idolater, Artemus Ward: "It is not so much the things we don't know that make us ridiculous, as knowing so many things that ain't so." Samuel Pickwick, Esq., president of the Pickwick Club, enjoyed a bubble reputation as an antiquarian until it was shown that the cryptic inscription on his famous discovery was simply "Bil Stumps, His Mark."

Canon Tucker is no mean rival of Mr. Pickwick, as the facts establish.

On February 16, Canon Tucker said, on the authority of Dr. Blakeney, "St Bonaventure, called the seraphic doctor, published a Psalter of the Virgin." At that time Dr. Blakeney was, in the words of Canon Tucker, "an eminent theologian." Later on he was styled "an accurate and serious writer." But the eminence, accuracy and seriousness of Dr. Blakeney were knocked into the proverbial cocked hat when it became known that the British Museum Catalogue described the work cited by him as "spurious."

On St. Patrick's Day, happy omen! with a flourish of trumpets Canon Tucker paraded on the local stage another of his favorites. This time it was the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom the canon vouched for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world to-day." Speer's speciality was the vilification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent—no small undertaking; and, incidentally, the collection of funds from the gullible victims of his falsehoods—an easier and more profitable operation. But Speer's reliability was seriously impaired when it was disclosed that he had offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope Leo XIII. and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago. It was not an enviable position for this "outstanding figure in the religious world," nor for his London sponsor. Canon Tucker now unblushingly admits that the documents were forgeries, but declares that Dr. Speer used them "in all good faith, thinking they were genuine." To be sure! Such is the defense of every slander-hawker when he is found out. But the point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries. With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: "At his request I keep his name secret." He even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forgery in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies: "The author of the letter" (that is the forger), "claims that the statements are all true, even to-day." It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct.

And such are Canon Tucker authorities! Oh! Geordie, jingling Geordie, it is grand to hear "spurious" Blakeney laying down the guilt of Catholic idolatry, and "good faith" Speer lecturing on the turpitude of South Americans, and all the while Canon Tucker waves his hat from the wings.

Canon Tucker declares that I have admitted that "there is such a book as the Psalter of the Virgin." That assertion, like so many others of Canon Tucker, is at direct variance with the facts. I have not at any time either admitted or denied the existence of "the Psalter of the Virgin." I know nothing of it; I have never seen it; I have failed in my search for it. It may exist. It may have been written by Titus Oates, or Dr. Blakeney, or Maria Monk, of the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, or Horatio Hocken, or Canon Tucker. But, used as it has been by the rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, it is "spurious." And that is as a somewhat damaging fact.

But I have come across a Psalter that has aroused my curiousty. It is to be found in Canon Tucker's own "Book of Common Prayer," in a service appointed in the Church of England for June 20, the anniversary of the accession of the late Queen Victoria. In that service the name of the Queen is substituted in more than half a dozen psalms. Thus it would seem that what is quite appropriate in the case of the Queen of England becomes rank idolatry when applied to the Queen of Heaven!

Canon Tucker's horror suffocates him as he writes of Catholic "worship" of the Blessed Virgin Mary. What of the foul idolatry approved by the "Book of Common Prayer" when, in the marriage service, it directs the husband to say to the wife: "With my body I thee worship?"

Canon Tucker is shocked to the innermost fiber, of his spiritual being by some of the terms of devotion, which he declares Catholics address to the Virgin Mary. What will he say of the dedication of the Approved Protestant Version of the Bible, wherein Queen Elizabeth is styled "that bright Occidental Star," where King James is likened to the sun and is described as "that Sanctified Person who, under God, is the immediate author of all their (his subjects) true happiness?"

And now I beg leave to bid a definite, if not very respectful, farewe to Canon Tucker and his blind, blundering guides, Blakeney and Speer. In doing so I desire to express the conviction that many devout Anglicans who love the Mother of God and pray to her, will not thank Canon Tucker for his attempt to throw obloquy upon that devotion. Nor are they apt to follow him in his unjustifiable accusation that Catholics are idolaters. Rather will they approve the words of Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate."

And it is Sydney Smith who wrote: "The more dirt, the less hurt."

M. F. FALLON
Bishop of London.

London, April 1, 1919.

London (Canada) Free Press Apr 24 '19

MR. SPEER'S LETTER.

Editor Free Press: Have taken quite an interest of late in the column of your paper reserved for "Letters to the Editor." Am sure that quite a number will agree with me that there's a reason. Although the big guns have ceased fire, the lesser lights, or rather the trench mortars are still at it, and in your issue of April 16 is a long letter from one signing himself "Robert E. Speer, of New York."

I am just a little suspicious of the letter. Its denials seem to be too general. Everything is denied, even what Rev. Mr. Speer slanders were "made in good faith believing taem to be true." All that is swept aside. It reminds one of the general denial of Sir Joseph Flavelle to the charges made by Sir Sam Hughes in Parliament a few weeks ago, and it appears that in both cases the culprits are getting away "with the bacon."

Mr. Editor, don't you think someone is just trying to confuse the issue, just trying to drag a red herring across the trail? Really, I don't believe the letter was ever written by Robert E. Speer, more likely by someone in Canon Tucker's backyard, who has located the pile of dust that settled from the cloud that he (Canon Tucker) claimed screened the exit of Bishop Fallon and is using it to blind those whom he is afraid did not notice the cloud when it first passed over. There are quite a few of us wide awake and we did not notice it, but (possibly account of much rain) it is the clear mud now. Even if Robert E. Speer did write the letter in question it is going to be very humiliating for Canon Tucker to make the excuse that his excuse for Robert E. Speer's excuse was "made in all good faith believing it to be true."

I thank you very much, Mr. Editor, for your time and for space in your valuable paper.

DIEU DEFEND LE DROIT.
La Salette, Ont., April 17, 1919.

THE VIRGIN MARY AND RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

Editor Free Press: I have followed with deep interest the Marian controversy which has been in progress in your columns. No Christian can fail to be interested when it is the honor of his Lord which is at stake. With your permission I will set down a few thoughts and facts for the consideration of those interested.

In the first place, I could not but notice the dissimulation on the part of Bishop Fallon's adherents in stating what is the place in Catholic teaching occupied by the Roman Mary. (I prefer always to distinguish between the Roman queen of heaven and "the mother of Jesus" presented in the Gospels.) One correspondent, J. J. M., says that he asks the Virgin Mary to pray for him, the same as Protestants ask their ministers to pray for them. If that were all that the worship of Mary amounted to there would be little to complain of, and "Mariolatry" would never form the subject of a newspaper controversy. But that is not all, and, moreover, every Catholic knows it. A few sober, doctrinal passages from Catholic authorities—not rhapsodical in any way—will suffice to prove this.

First, let us take the "infallible" utterance of Pope Leo in his encyclical letter, dated 1849: "The virgin. . . being constituted between Christ and His church, and being wholly sweet and full of graces, hath ever delivered the Christian people from calamities of all sorts." "For ye know very well, brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any salvation, it rebounds to us from her, because such is His will who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary."

Now a passage from the prayer book "St. John's Manual," recommended in 1856 by John, Archbishop of New York: "I worship thee, O great queen. . . I thank thee for having delivered me from hell, which I have so often deserved." "I place all my hopes in thee, and confide my salvation to thy care." "By thee we have been reconciled to our God, thou art the only advocate of sinners, we have no hope but in thee, O most pure virgin." (P. P. 886, 887.)

Bernardine Senesis (Sermon 61, article 1): "All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself." "God has the supremacy of justice, Mary of grace."

The same author, quoted by Liguori: "Jesus is the only mediator of justice between God and men, but because men recognize and fear in Jesus Christ the Divine Majesty that resides in Him as God, the Lord wished to appoint another advocate, to whom we could have recourse with less fear and more confidence. This advocate is Mary."

Now this is the teaching that Protestants object to, not asking the Virgin for her supplications. Bishop Fallon might reply that this is not the teaching of the Catholic church; but did anyone ever hear of Pope Leo being deposed for heretical statements regarding the source of our salvation? Did anyone ever hear of the Archbishop of New York being censured for giving his imprimatur to a prayer book that made such astounding protestations? Would anyone find the works of Bernardine Senesis or of Alphonse Liguori on the Index Expurgatorius? If not, can one be charged with unfairness in assuming that these are the doctrines taught in the Catholic church?

A grotesque excuse is offered for the extravagant expressions used in the adoration of the Virgin Mary by the same correspondent, and I have been surprised to find that it is the stock argument advanced in most Catholic apologetical works. The expressions are admitted, but it is pleaded that the users don't mean them! Interrupt the coarse blasphemer and censure him for taking the name of the Lord in vain, and he will plead—that he doesn't mean it! Comparing the expressions used in supposedly Christian worship—which is worshipping the Fatherin spirit and in truth—with those of an ardent lover betrays a moral levity that in divine things is most deplorable.

But the question naturally arises, What is the origin and foundation of "the Marian system," upon which such an amazing fabric has been raised?

Is it founded in Holy Scripture?

There are two texts in the Scriptures by which Rome seeks to justify its adoration of the Virgin Mary. Both are falsifications of the original, and the first is the most disgraceful forgery in sacred literature. I refer to Genesis iii., 15, where the promise of a Redeemer is turned into the promise of a Redemptoress by the substitution of the feminine Ipsa for the masculine Ipse, in the present Latin Vulgate, making the text run, "She shall bruise thy head," referring to the serpent. A precious piece of "infallibility," established by the Council of Trent! The second text advanced is Luke i, 28, where Rome has ingeniously transposed the salutation of the angel from "Hail, thou that are highly favored," to "Hail, full of grace," as a consultation of the original Greek will show. Brethren, the truth of God does not need to be bolstered up with falsehood. The lie is only the hallmark of the father of lies.

Turn to the voluminous writings of the post apostolic and ante-Nicene age, and we find not even the slightest trace of the honor paid to the Virgin Mary which was destined nigh to overwhelm the Christian faith. The notice given to her is slightingly small. Some of the ante-Nicene writers do not even accord her perpetual virginity, so far from ascribing to her an immaculate conception. Tertullian says that Christ repudiated his relationship with her when He said, indicating the disciples standing about, "Behold my mother and my brethren." So far from holding the doctrine of the assumption, they offered prayers for her along with the other blest departed in their liturgies. One can search in vain during the first three hundred years of the Christian era for any invocation of the Virgin Mary. Will any candid—nay, I say, will any honest man assert in the face of these facts that the Virgin Mary could have held such a place in the faith of the primitive church as she now holds in the Roman system—Redemptoress, Mediatrix of Mercy, Only Hope of Sinners? Or will anyone assert that the dogma of the immaculate conception was believed "always, everywhere and by all?"

But I must hasten on. Mary worship was established in the fifth century by the famous Council of Ephesus, the record of the proceedings of which can only fill the Christian reader with shame. The solemn words of the Lord Jesus, "No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father," carried no import in the minds of men who would not scruple to win a council by fraud and violence, and men who would permit their unregenerate followers to conduct baccanalian revelry "in honor of the martyrs" would not fear to invade the veiled and sacred mystery of the person of our Lord with their unholy feet. So the Virgin Mary is enthroned as "mother of God."

As to what followed, I may forestall the inevitable cries of "Calumny" by quoting a Catholic historian, and a very eminent one, M. de Beugnot, in his work, "The history of the Destruction of Paganism." After the Council of Ephesus the churches of the East and West offered to the adoration of the faithful the Virgin Mary, victorious over a violent attack. The people were dazzled with the image of the divine mother. . . They received the new worship with an enthusiasm sometimes too great, since, for many Christians (?) this worship became the whole of Christianity. . . The heathens. . . opened to Mary the temples which they had kept shut against Jesus Christ and confessed themselves conquered. It is true they often mixed with the adoration of Mary those heathen ideas, those vain practices, those ridiculous superstitions from which they seemed unable to separate themselves. The church, however, was delighted to see them enter her bosom, because she knew well it would be easy for her with the help of time to purify from its alloy a worship whose essence was purity itself.

Under such auspices Mary-worship found its origin. The temples of the heathen, closed against the meek and lowly Jesus, are thrown open to the new Cybele, and unregenerate heathens who could not bear the light of the Gospel can disport before the virgin mother, while the church looks on and smiles. And Satan smiles, too. For instead of saying that Mary-worship became in many quarters "the whole of Christianity," it would be more correct to say that it superseded Christianity. But this is only the beginning of the superstition. Soon the church will borrow from Mahomet the doctrine of the immaculate conception, the virgin mother will be enthroned as "queen of heaven," school men will debate on "which is the greater" in heaven—Christ or Mary, and adorers will invent in her honor "The Psalter of Our Lady" to the exclusion of God Himself.

And if we decry the shameful dishonor that the Catholic church has brought upon the Blessed Virgin by its gross caricature of "the mother of Jesus," so beautifully delineated by the Holy Spirit in the four Gospels, what shall we say of the dishonor it has wrought to our Lord, and the delusion it has given to its millions of devotees, in directing them away from the "One Mediator between God and men," to a false 'mediatrix" founded only in the superstitions of men. It is the old story repeated, alas, throughout the history of Christendom— of "anything but Christ."

May editorial patience bear with me in this effort to set forth the truth.

S. J. DEAR.

Hamilton, Ont., April 15.

OPEN FORUM OF THE PEOPLE

Lawton Advertiser — Apl 19, 1919

Observant Advertiser Readers With a Grievance, a Suggestion For Reform, a Good Word—Yes, and Sometimes a Grouch, State Their Views on Topics of the Hour In City and Nation and All Creation.

BISHOP FALLON TO ROBERT E. SPEER.

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

The letter of Mr. Robert E. Speer, which you publish this morning, is an exquisite specimen of a neat rivulet of quibbling fact meandering through a meadow of cunning equivocation. Mr. Speer is a self-confessed peddler of malicious forgery against the Catholics of South America, and, as such, might easily be left to the luxury of his own reflections. But his authority was dragged into a local controversy, and he has not me to blame for the exposure of his shortcomings as an historian. I propose to show that Mr. Speer has not improved his position by his latest communication, and for that purpose I shall deal with it in paragraphs "explicitly, one by one."

1. Mr. Speer says: "I am not the Rev. Mr. Speer." I am a layman. I accept the correction, and apologize to Mr. Speer for my error. I likewise apologize to the clergy for having included him in their number. As justification of my mistake I might mention that in seven letters written to him by Rev. Father Martin, between April, 1910, and May, 1912, he was addressed as "Rev. Robert E. Speer," and "Reverend Dear Sir." In none of his replies did he deny the soft impeachment.

2. Mr. Speer says: "I have never collected any funds from those who heard these addresses, or read these publications, or from anyone else." Mr. Speer is the secretary of a board of foreign missions, with headquarters in New York. The whole purpose of Mr. Speer's trip to South America and of his subsequent false and calumnious books and lectures was to arouse Protestant enthusiasm for the evangelization of the benighted Catholics of South America and the securing of funds for that object. Mr. Speer would have been far more fittingly employed in protecting the fundamental doctrines of Christianity among his own associates than in slandering the Catholics of the South American continent, the latchet of whose shoes he is not worthy to lose.

3. It took Mr. Speer only a few months to discover the defects of the Catholicity of the whole continent of South America. He needed, however, more than two years of prodding before publicly admitting that he was engaged in the industrious circulation of fraudulent documents. He had been notified on October 18, 1910, that Rome declared the reputed papal encyclical to be "a palpable fraud and forgery." The alleged reply of the Archbishop of Chile to the papal letter would necessarily likewise be a forgery and a fraud. And of this fact Mr. Speer was himself informed by his South African agent and friend, the Rev. Webster E. Browning, who wrote to him as follows: "I called at once on this gentleman (the forger), and stated the case to him, and, without a word, he arose, went to his safe, unlocked it, and brought out a book of clippings of his articles contributed to the press since 1878. He at once turned to the two articles—the pseudo-letter of the pope and the reply of the archbishop—and stated that he had written them both . . . and laughed at the whole matter as a huge joke." Mr. Speer cannot get away from the record now by mixing up archbishops in Caracas, Venezuela, Santiago, Chile and Honolulu.

4. Mr. Speer avails himself of a similar unworthy subterfuge with regard to the concealment of the name of the forger. He is technically right, but he is shamefully wrong. It is true that he is not originally responsible for the failure to reveal the name of the author of the rotten forgery which he circulated. He merely co-operated effectually in the concealment. The Rev. Webster E. Browning was the agent and friend with whom Mr. Speer communicated in South Africa, and Mr. Speer appropriated and published in his book these words of Mr. Browning: "At his request (the forger's) I keep his name secret, but you are authorized to use my letter and statements as you think best. The author of the letters claims that the statements are all true, even today." Mr. Speer is welcome to any comfort he may derive from the fact that these are his own words. But in the minds of unprejudiced readers he will scarcely escape his share in the guilt of his chosen attorney. The effect of the failure to disclose the name of the forger has been evident in the course of the local controversy, for one correspondent stated that the forger was "presumably a Roman Catholic," while another went the length of declaring that he was "a Roman Catholic priest." In view of the secrecy surrounding his identity, and the scrupulous care taken by Rev. Mr. Browning and Mr. Speer not to give the public his name, I should be quite justified in assuming that the forger was really one of Mr. Speer's South African friends and confederates.

5. The evidence of the forgery was given to the press, not by Mr. Speer, but by the Rev. Father Martin, who for two years had been insisting that Mr. Speer should either justify or retract his references to this coarse and fraudulent papal encyclical. On May 12, 1912, Father Martin wrote to Mr. Speer: "I am taking the liberty of turning over our correspondence to the editor of the Catholic Universe."

6. The view held by Mr. Speer in Chile is well illustrated by a letter under date of June 27, 1910, written by Mr. C. E. Spencer, of the firm of Spencer and Waters, Chilean importers. Mr. Spencer writes with regard to the calumny against the Catholic clergy of Chile: "The author, a Mr. Speer, whom I had occasion to know some years ago, is one of those persons who qualify all who do not have his belief as a bad kind, as though his belief was the only correct one. I am a North American who has lived in Chile for 45 years, and, though educated a Protestant, have always been taught to respect the belief of others. . . . The Catholic clergy are a body of men to be highly respected, and it would be well if the author of the calumny would take lessons from them instead of defaming them. . . . I would not desire to change places with Mr. Speer, who has made a futile attempt to calumniate a body of men who are so evidently his superiors."

7. Mr. Speer reproaches me with a lack of courtesy, and invokes the words of Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names which they themselves repudiate." This is the same Mr. Speer who in his book, "South American Problems," published years ago, wrote the following sentences: "The great mass of South American people have not been given Christianity. . . . The central place is Mary's. Mary is the central religious person. . . . Mary, not Christ. And Mariolatry is the religion of the land because the church has taught it as true Christianity."

In dealing with Mr. Speer and his imitators I throw courtesy to the winds. I ask no quarter, and give none.

†M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, April 16, 1919.

RECEIVED
APR 22
Mr. Speer

The Bible and the Blessed Virgin Mary

Some Correspondence

ISSUED BY
The Catholic Unity League of Canada
ST. PETER'S SEMINARY, LONDON, ONTARIO

"I will put enmity between thee and the Woman."

Genesis, III—15.

Almighty God declared that enmity towards the Woman would be a characteristic of the devil. Enmity means ill-will, antipathy, aversion, hostility, animosity, hatred. These sentiments engender garbling, distortion, suppression, misrepresentation, forgery, falsehood, slander and calumny.

A local phase of the universal fact is illustrated in the pages of this pamphlet.

✠ M. F. FALLON,
BISHOP OF LONDON.

THE BIBLE AND THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

The London Advertiser of February 3, 1919, contained the following statement :

In the course of his sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral yesterday morning, Rev. Canon L. N. Tucker took occasion to deal with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as enunciated by Pope Pius IX. in 1854, declaring it to be the "greatest aberration in the history of Christendom." He stated that the first six centuries of Christianity, the period of the fathers, held no such doctrine, and that it was disproven by the very words of the Virgin Mary herself, who, in the Magnificat, declared : "My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour." It was plain that she regarded herself as among those who needed a Saviour.

This was further shown by the fact that the last gimpse afforded of her by the Bible shows her with the disciples in prayer before the opening up of the great apostolic effort to take the gospel to the whole world.

The preacher pointed out further that the Bible declared that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, no exception being made at all. In recent years this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had been carried so far that the name of the Virgin was substituted for the name of Jesus Christ in the Te Deum and other services of the Catholic Church."

The Bishop of London at once wrote the subjoined letter :

To the Editor of The Advertiser :

Your issue of yesterday carries a paragraph under prominent headlines in which Rev. Canon L. N. Tucker, rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, is reported to have characterized the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the "greatest aberration in the history of Christendom."

I have no intention of questioning Canon Tucker's qualifications as an expert on aberrations. Nor, at the present moment, shall I discuss his palpable and inexcusable ignorance of the subject upon which he undertakes to enlighten his congregation.

But I do protest against the columns of The Advertiser being made a vehicle for false witness as regards the teaching of the Catholic Church. Canon Tucker is credited by you with having used the following words: "In recent years this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had been carried so far that the name of the Virgin was substituted for the name of Jesus Christ in the Te Deum and other services of the Catholic Church." That statement is absolutely false and without any foundation in fact. As the official head of the Catholic Church in this city, I respectfully request The Advertiser and Canon Tucker to make public their justification for giving currency to an untruth so glaring that even the slightest investigation would have furnished its utter disproof.

Your faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,

Bishop of London.

London, Ontario, February 4, 1919.

CANON TUCKER'S OWN VERSION

Canon Tucker declares that he did not say that the name of the Virgin Mary had been substituted in the official services of the church, but that he did say that the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary,—Immaculate Conception, Assumption, etc.—was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the early Church, and was the "greatest aberration in the history of Christianity." Leaders of the Catholic Church, he says, have been promoting the glories of Mary and ascribing to her the attributes of Christ Himself, calling her "The Queen of Heaven," "The Refuge of Sinners," etc. In societies interested in promoting beliefs in her glories, her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum, but Canon Tucker does not think that this has been done in St. Peter's Cathedral or with the official sanction of the Catholic Church.

Editorial Note.—The Advertiser believes there is no substantial difference between what was reported to have been said by Canon Tucker and his own version of his sermon.

As to The Advertiser's being made the "vehicle for false witness as regards the teaching of the Catholic Church," we feel sure that Bishop Fallon will agree that a newspaper's function is to make public those statements which are made by responsible men and ministers. Apart from the seeking of news, the seeking of truth is the newspaper's duty, and in this very instance, should not the truth become known? Would His Lordship have heard that such a charge had been made had he not read it in The Advertiser? Would he ever have had the chance to dispute a statement publicly circulated

through the medium of the pulpit and transmitted from lip to lip by several hundred persons ?

LETTER FROM BISHOP FALLON.

To the Editor of The Advertiser :

With the attitude of The Advertiser towards the publication of any statements made by responsible men and ministers I can find no fault. The implied promise to give reasonable opportunity for reply to those who have been attacked is straightforward and honest. I wish I could say as much for the clumsy attempt of Canon Tucker to evade responsiblity for his alleged pulpit utterances. To falsehood the reverend gentleman now adds shiftiness. He has been the victim of defective reporting. He did not say that "the name of the Virgin had been substituted for that of Jesus Christ in the official services of the Church," but "leaders of the Catholic Church have been ascribing the attributes of Christ Himself," and "her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum," though—and here the Canon makes a comical effort at conciliation — he "does not think that this has been done in St. Peter's Cathedral or with the official sanction of the Catholic Church."

Does Canon Tucker imagine that he is dealing with children ? Does he fancy that he is to be allowed to chalk up his second-hand calumnies against the Catholic Church in his pulpit or in the public print, and then run away ? I charge Canon Tucker with complete ignorance of the doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, and I challenge him to show proofs for his indefensible distortions of facts that are within the reach of all.

One thing, it seems clear, Canon Tucker did say : "The whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary is directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the early Church." The Canon is apparently cocksure of his position ; he, at least, has no doubts as to the length and breadth and depth of his acquaintance with both biblical and patristic lore. He has settled with final and almost superstitious infallibility and in a single sentence the teaching of the Bible and of the early Church on one of the most profound mysteries of Christianity. With the air of an oriental autocrat he discourses of "the greatest aberration in history ;" there is simply nothing to be said on the other side. The Canon has spoken ; the case is closed.

But the case is not closed. What the Bible teaches of the Blessed Virgin Mary I propose to deal with in the pulpit of my

cathedral on next Sunday evening, and those who are interested in the subject are cordially invited to attend. To-day, may I claim, without making too great demands upon your space, the courtesy of your columns to set forth the briefest and most incomplete sketch of the view of the early Church on the Blessed Virgin Mary ? Canon Tucker, or anyone else, may have upon request, the references and the original Greek or Latin text of the quotations I here set down.

The Liturgy of St. James, in the 1st century, repeats four times the following words: "The Most Holy, Immaculate, Most Glorious Mother of God, our Lady and ever-Virgin Mary." Likewise in another place : "Mary, all-blameless and Mother of God, more to be honored than the cherubim, and more glorious than the seraphim."

In the 2nd century, St. Justin writes : "Through the Virgin Mary the Holy One was born ; of her was born the Son of God." Similarly, St. Irenaeus ; "By Eve the human race had been bound to death ; by Mary it was loosed."

In the 3rd century, St. Cyril writes : "Through Eve came death ; through Mary, life appeared." And St. Gregory, who attended the first council of Antioch : "The Immaculate and Holy Virgin Mary ; more glorious and more saintly than all the rest of human kind, having a mind whiter than snow, and a soul more purified than the finest gold."

In the 4th century St. Dionysius writes : "Our Lady, Christ's Holy Tabernacle, Mother, incorruptible and blessed from head to foot." And St. Ephrem speaks of the Blessed Virgin as "alone most pure in soul and body, alone surpassing all uprightness, alone made the dwelling-place of all the graces of the Most Holy Spirit."

But why should I go further ? Or why tax your patience ? I might multiply the tributes of the fathers of the early Church to the incomparable holiness and grandeur of the Blessed Virgin Mary until they would fill volumes. With what face, then, can Canon Tucker describe the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this point as "the greatest aberration in the history of Christianity ?" And how colossal is his ignorance of the teaching of the early Church !

Yours faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, Ont., Feb. 5, 1919.

Bishop Fallon then categorically challenged the following statements of the Canon :

On last Wednesday the rector of St. Paul's Cathedral gave publicity, through the columns of the London Advertiser, to certain charges against the teachings of the Catholic Church. The Reverend Canon Tucker said :—

1st—"That the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the early Church."

That statement is entirely false. There is not an atom of truth in it. I call upon the Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral to prove this charge, or to retract it as publicly as it was made.

2nd—That "leaders of the Catholic Church have been promoting the glories of Mary and ascribing to her the attributes of Christ Himself."

The second clause in the above sentence is absolutely false. I call upon the Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral to prove it, or to retract it as publicly as it was made.

3rd—That "in societies interested in promoting beliefs in her (Mary's) glories, her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum for the name of Christ."

That statement is false. I call upon the Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral to prove it, or to retract it as publicly as it was made.

4th—That the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is "the greatest aberration in the history of Christianity."

That statement is grotesque, extravagant, insulting and false. It is a gross violation of the rule laid down by Canon Tucker himself on December 18th, 1916, when, over his own name he caused to be published the following words in the columns of the London Advertiser :—"Preachers should take care that they use language that does not invite misapprehension and controversy."

Judged by his own standards Canon Tucker owes a complete and unqualified apology to the people of this community. He has broken religious peace and he cannot escape the consequences.

SERMON

In keeping with his announcement, Bishop Fallon preached in St. Peter's Cathedral on Sunday evening, February 2nd, on the Bible and the Blessed Virgin Mary. Below is the text of the sermon :

"Behold from henceforth all generations shall call Me blessed."—St. Luke, 1. 48.

Dearly Beloved Brethren :

"When a few days ago I read in one of London's daily papers

that a minister in a prominent church had declared in his pulpit that the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary was contrary to the teachings of the Bible, the first question that came into my mind was,—why do not Protestants leave us alone? We can take care of ourselves; we know what we believe; we are not interfering with the beliefs of others; why do they not treat our doctrines fairly? Are slander, false witness, misrepresentation, accusations of aberration, and whisperings behind closed doors, to be their method in dealing with the teachings of the Catholic Church? And then I asked myself. What pleasure can a Christian minister find in attempting to diminish the honor and reverence paid to the Mother of our Redeemer? What good is accomplished by such attacks? Do they strengthen the faith of any Christian? Do they stop the sneers of any scoffer? Do they increase the number of reverent believers in Christ?

But the sentiment that was uppermost in my heart was one of intense indignation. The position and prerogatives of our Blessed Mother, the Virgin Mary, had been wantonly assailed. Our love of her had been wounded in its tenderest spot. The statement had been deliberately made that Catholic reverence of Mary had no justification in the inspired Word of God. It was clear that upon us rested the solemn obligation of vindicating Catholic doctrine and at the same time explaining and emphasizing the preeminent place which Mary is given in the Sacred Scriptures.

The assailant of Mary's rights has appealed to the Bible; to the Bible we shall go.

What I shall say to you tonight will be taken entirely from the Bible. The Catholic Church pays no other honor to the Virgin Mary than what is ascribed to her in the Bible. For every Catholic devotion to Mary has its reason, its basis, its justification and its defense in the holy and inspired Word of God. The Bible is composed of two great divisions: the Old and the New Testament. The Old Testament is the shadow, the New is the substance; the Old is the type, the New is the reality; the Old is the prophecy, the New is the fulfilment.

In my consideration of the Bible and the Blessed Virgin Mary, I shall carefully avoid all those types and figures that crowd the pages of the books of the Old Law and which the Fathers and Doctors of the Church are unanimous in applying to the Mother of the Saviour to come; nor shall I avail myself of the numerous passages where saints and biblical scholars have found clear allusion to her mission and her glories. I will cling close to those words of the Sacred Text concerning

whose meaning and whose application to the Virgin Mary there can be no manner of question.

In the very first book of the Bible, and in almost its first chapter, we are introduced to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Here are the words :

> "The Lord God said to the woman (Eve) Why hast thou done this ? And she answered, The serpent deceived me, and I did eat. And the Lord God said to the serpent (the devil) . . . I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; she shall crush thy head and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel."—Genesis, iii., 13-15.

In this scene we have three parties, the man, the woman and the serpent, and in the fulfilment of the prophecy we likewise are shown three parties ; but in the fulfilment, the man is to be the second Adam and the woman the second Eve. Amongst all commentators of Scripture there is not a single dissentient voice that in speaking of the offspring of Eve Almighty God had reference to the Messiah to come and His mother. The woman and her son became for prophet, priest and patriarch the source of inspiration and the subject of meditation in all the ages that were to precede the coming of the Messiah. For more than three thousand years this thought filled the world with hope ; it alone bore God's people up against despair. Every Jewish mother hoped that her child might be the mother of the Saviour, and every Jewish maiden prayed that she might be chosen for the signal honour. As in this first message of hope after the fall of man the Saviour and the woman stand united, so in every subsequent passage of Holy Writ the Mother and the Son are found together.

Seven hundred years before the event the prophet Isaias, that inspired mouth-piece of the Most High, spoke these significant words :

> The Lord Himself shall give you a sign, Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel, (God with us)—Isaias, vii., 14.

And this glorious prophetic vision, which links together the Virgin and her Son became more and more distinct as the years went on, until in the fullness of time God sent His Son made of a woman.

But if the Old Testament gives these undisputed prophecies of the function, dignity and glory of Mary, it is in the New Testament that we must seek her real picture. The Old Testament gives but the outline. But outside the Catholic

Church men seem to be satisfied with a skeleton of her. For them an outline, a skeleton suffices ; there is no room for colour, for flesh and blood. They call her Mary when they do not call her worse ; seldom the Virgin Mary, rarely the Blessed Virgin, and never the Mother of God. Yet the Bible makes her the Mother of God. The title comes to her from the Holy Book. Read the testimony of St. Luke :—

> "In the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God into a city of Galilee, called Nazareth, to a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph of the house of David ; and the Virgin's name was Mary. And the Angel being come in, said to her ; Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee ; blessed art thou among women. Who having heard, was troubled at his saying, and thought within herself what manner of salutation this should be. And the Angel said to her ; Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God. Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son ; and thou shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father ; and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end. And Mary said to the Angel, How shall this be done ? because I know not man. And the Angel answering said to her ; The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy (One) which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. And behold thy cousin Elizabeth, she also hath conceived a son in her old age ; and this is the sixth month with her that is called barren ; because no word shall be impossible with God And Mary said : Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done to me according to thy word. And the Angel departed from her." St. Luke 1, 26-38.

What comment can any human voice make upon these words of the Bible ? What comment is there to make ? God sent an Archangel to a humble virgin, and that ambassador from the heavenly court spoke a message, such as no other human ears before or since have been privileged to hear. Coming in to her he said : "Hail, full of Grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women." That is all we ask of anyone to believe of the Blessed Virgin,—that she is blessed with the blessedness of her Divine Son. From an

angel's lips came the words that Catholics love to say in prayer. There may be some who have not known what these words mean. Tell them now and let them know henceforth that you are repeating the words of the Archangel Gabriel. Whether for high or humble, for educated or ignorant, there are no more appropriate words of praise and prayer on Christian lips than the Hail Mary.

After this annunciation by the angel of the glory in store for her as Mother of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary visited her cousin St. Elizabeth.

I shall use no other words to describe that holy meeting than those of the Evangelist himself. Here they are :—

> "Mary, rising up in those days, went into the hill country with haste into a city of Juda. And she entered into the house of Zachary, and saluted Elizabeth. And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant leaped in her womb. And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and she cried out with a loud voice and said : Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me ? For behold as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy. And blessed art thou that hast believed, because those things shall be accomplished that were spoken to thee by the Lord. And Mary said : My soul doth magnify the Lord : and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Because He hath regarded the humility of His handmaid : for behold from henceforth all generations shall call Me blessed." St. Luke 1, 39-56.

Can these words, beloved brethren, be made more clear or more expressive by any mere human explanation ?

Mary went to visit her cousin St. Elizabeth, the mother of St. John the Baptist, who was at that time within three months of his birth and of whom Christ Himself said that a greater than he had not arisen among the children of men : St. Elizabeth spoke to her cousin inspired words, "She was filled with the Holy Ghost :" her words were therefore prompted by the Holy Ghost ; they were in a very special sense the words of God Himself. If the response given by the Blessed Virgin to the salutation of her cousin at that time were not true, then it is a wonder God did not strike her dead ; and if they are true, then all Catholic praises of the Virgin Mother fall short of what is her due. Men sometimes wonder that we call Mary "Our

Life, Our Sweetness and Our Hope," "Mother of Mercy" "Refuge of Sinners," "Queen of Heaven," but what are all these titles to that one name, Mother of God? What homage, what dignity, what reverence in that title, Mary Mother of God? And Mary is the Mother of God; the Bible tells us so. That child born of her and foretold in this chapter was the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity made man. He who does not believe this is not a Christian; whatever else he may be, he is not a Christian. For the fundamental doctrine of Christianity is that God the Son became man; that in Him were two natures; that He came down from heaven and took not a human personality, but a human nature, and raised it to consort with the divine nature, supported by the divine person. Mary is the woman who brought that person into the world. No woman is the mother of anything save a person. My mother is not the mother of my body, nor is she the mother of my soul; she is the mother of the person who is speaking to you. In the 4th century the Fathers of the council of Ephesus, because the honour paid to Mary as Mother of God had been questioned, declared it to be a doctrine of Christian faith that Mary was the Mother of God.

"My soul doth magnify the Lord," exclaimed Mary. Magnify means to make greater. What a startling expression on the lips of her who but a moment before had declared that the Lord had regarded the humility of his handmaid. But Mary did make the Lord greater. If the heavens are telling the glory of God, if all creatures proclaim the greatness of the Creator, then must she who was the masterpiece of God's creative power in a manner all her own magnify the Lord. She alone reaches the highest sanctity of created beings, she alone is the Mother of the Saviour. And Mary adds, when speaking to her cousin—with unbearable forwardness if the words are not true,—"And, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." Do all generations call her blessed? Was it calling her blessed to attack the position given her by the Catholic Church? To say that she has no place in the Word of God? We Catholics have always maintained her in that place which the Bible gives her; we have contended and will contend to the end of time, for the glory, the dignity and the divine maternity of Mary, and for all the truths connected therewith. Do those who assail these truths call her blessed? If not, how can they face the Bible? What right have they to appeal to the Bible? They belie the Bible. The man who dares to speak one word against the Mother of Jesus had better tear the Bible to pieces and burn it. The only generation that has always called her

blessed, that has stood true to the prophecy of Mary concerning herself, is the generation known as the Catholic Church. Our consistent cry has ever been " Blessed Mother of God."

The constant care and tender watchfulness exercised by God Himself over the predestined Mother of His Divine Son are well illustrated in these words of the Bible :—

> " When as Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child, of the Holy Ghost. Whereupon Joseph, being a just man, and not willing publicly to expose her, was minded to put her away privately. But while he thought on these things, behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him in his sleep saying : Joseph, son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son : And thou shalt call his name Jesus. For He shall save His people from their sins. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet, saying : Behold a Virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. And Joseph, rising up from sleep did as the Angel of the Lord had commanded him."— St. Matt. 1, 18-24.

You see then, beloved brethren, that even during her lifetime Mary barely escaped calumny. In her earliest years the evil one prompted men to slander her. Who saved Mary ? Even her own husband was minded to put her away privately. But God Himself protected her and His voice spoke to Joseph in sleep through an angel, who told him that the child to be born was created in Mary's womb by God Himself, even as Eve had been created, and that that child was the hope of the people, the expected of nations, the Redeemer of the world, for whose coming men had watched during four thousand years.

At length the moment arrived when God's mercy was to be manifested to mankind by the coming of His Son as the world's Redeemer. And in the description of this divine event, the Bible gives Mary a place of pathetic interest and sublime grandeur.

> " It came to pass that in those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that the whole world should be enrolled. And Joseph also went up from Galilee to Bethlehem, to be enrolled with Mary his espoused wife who was with child. And it came to pass that when they were there her days were accomplished

that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her first-born Son, and wrapped Him up in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger ; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds watching and keeping the night watches over their flock. And behold an Angel of the Lord stood by them, and the brightness of God shone round about them, and they feared with a great fear. And the Angel of the Lord said to them : Fear not : for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, that shall be to all the people : for this day is born to you a Saviour, Who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David. And this shall be a sign unto you ; you shall find the infant wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger. And suddenly there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly army, praising God and saying : Glory to God in the highest : and on earth peace to men of good will. And it came to pass, after the Angels departed from them into Heaven, the shepherds said one to another : Let us go over to Bethlehem, and let us see this word that is come to pass, which the Lord hath showed to us. And they came with haste, and they found Mary and Joseph, and the Infant lying in the manger. And seeing, they understood the word that had been spoken concerning this Child. And all that heard wondered ; and at those things that were told them by the shepherds. But Mary kept all these words, pondering them in her heart."—St. Luke, ii, 1-19.

What instructive inferences may not be drawn from these words. A young girl goes up from Nazareth to Bethlehem in the company of her husband, a man past middle age. Her delicate condition calls for kindness, rest and shelter. But no place can be found for her ; "there was no room for them in the inn." She is obliged to seek refuge in a stable. And there the Son of God is born. Ah, brethren, there are many places in the world to-day where there is no room for Mary. There are churches from which she is excluded and in which she is insulted. But this will never be true of the Catholic Church, for in the humblest Catholic chapel as in the most glorious cathedral there will always be room for Mary. There were many on that far-off night who, had they known the destiny of the pilgrim at their doors, would themselves have gladly gone cold and shelterless to give her a fitting refuge. But what excuse can they offer who, in our own day and with full

knowledge of her place in the gospels, close their hearts, their homes, their churches to her blessed influence and presence ? Not so with Catholics. We follow the Bible. In the very first words of Genesis the Woman and the Child are put together in prophecy ; in the fulfilment of the prophecy the Mother and the Son are kept united. In Catholic doctrine and devotion they will not be divided.

The Bible next shows us Jesus and Mary together at the ceremony of the Purification.

> "There was a man in Jerusalem named Simeon ; and the Holy Ghost was in him. And when his parents brought in the Child Jesus, to do for him according to the custom of the law, Simeon blessed them and said to Mary His Mother : Behold this Child is set for the fall and for the resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be contradicted ; and thine own soul a sword shall pierce, that out of many hearts thoughts may be revealed."—St. Luke, ii, 25-35.

What a sword of grief, beloved brethren, pierced the Blessed Mother's soul in the passion and death of her Divine Son ! And can we not easily realize that no small part of the bitterness of that soul-piercing sword of grief was caused by the knowledge of the ingratitude of men who would put asunder what God had joined together, and who, while professing to honor the Son, are so prompt in dishonoring the Mother ?

The adoration of Jesus by the Wise Men of the East affords further scriptural evidence of the union of Son and Mother.

> "There came wise men from the East to Jerusalem, saying, where is He that is born King of the Jews ? For we have seen His star and have come to adore Him. And entering into the house they found the Child with Mary His Mother, and falling down they adored Him ; and opening their treasures, they offered Him gifts ; gold, frankincense, and myrrh. And having received an answer in sleep that they should not return to Herod, they went back another way into their own country."—St. Matt. ii, 1-11.

Here once more is the model for Catholic devotion. Like the Wise Men we find Jesus and Mary together ; like them we fall down to ADORE HIM. But we do not fall so low as to fail to understand that His Mother is also there.

The protection of the Almighty over Mother and Son is set forth in the biblical account of the Flight into Egypt.

"After the Wise Men were departed, behold an Angel of the Lord appeared in sleep to Joseph, saying : Arise and take the Child and His Mother and fly into Egypt : and be there until I shall tell thee. For it will come to pass that Herod will seek the Child to destroy Him. Who rose and took the Child and His Mother by night and retired into Egypt : and he was there until the death of Herod ; that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet (Osee) saying : Out of Egypt have I called My Son.

"But when Herod was dead, behold an Angel of the Lord appeared in sleep to Joseph in Egypt, saying : Arise, and take the Child and His Mother, and go into the land of Israel ; for they are dead that sought the life of the Child. Who arose, and took the Child and His Mother and came into the land of Israel. But hearing that Archelaus reigned in Juda in the room of Herod his father, he was afraid to go thither ; and being warned in sleep retired into the quarters of Galilee. And coming he dwelt in a city called Nazareth."—St. Matt. ii, 13-23.

The position of Mary is again set forth in the scripture narrative of the finding of Jesus in the Temple.

"And it came to pass that after three days they found Him in the temple. And His Mother said to Him : Son, why hast thou done so to us ? Behold thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing. And He said to them : How is it that you sought Me ? Did you not known that I must be about my father's business ? And they understood not the word that He spoke unto them. And He went down with them, and came to Nazareth ; and was subject to them. And his Mother kept all these words in her heart."—St. Luke, ii, 46-51.

There are those who, in their intense desire to disparage Mary, read into the words "Did you not know that I must be about my father's business ?" a meaning that is more dishonoring to Our Lord than to His Blessed Mother. They would have us believe that Jesus was rude and impertinent to His Mother ; they make no allowance for the infinite Mystery of His divine mission ; they pass over the expression "And they understood not the word that He spoke to them :" they utterly fail to emphasize that He "was subject to them." They seem to insinuate that men may walk more readily into the presence of the Son if they can present a certificate of having dishonored the Mother ; that they may be assured

of the good graces of the Son just in proportion to their success in diminishing the respect paid to the woman who bore Him. They would make Jesus more ungrateful, less tender and less loving than any human child that was ever born. They are in open variance with the whole course of Christian history. All that is highest and noblest in art and sculpture, in music and architecture is instinct with and inspired by reverence for the prerogatives of Mary. They are in direct contradiction with sentiments of illustrious non-Catholics. The poet, Wordsworth, addresses Mary as "Woman above all women glorified ; our tainted nature's solitary boast." Hawthorne says of her : "I have always envied Catholics their faith in that sweet, Sacred Virgin Mother, who stands between them and the deity, intercepting somewhat of His awful splendor, yet permitting His love to stream upon the worshipper more intelligently to human comprehension through the medium of a woman's tenderness." Of her, Sir Walter Scott writes :

> "Safe may we sleep beneath thy care,
> Though banished, outcast and reviled—
> Maiden, hear a maiden's prayer!
> Mother, hear a suppliant child !
> Ave Maria ! Undefiled !"

The rationalist, Lecky, teaches a lesson to clerical detractors of the Blessed Virgin. "The world," he writes, "is governed by its ideals ; and seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound and on the whole a more salutary influence than the doctrine concerning the Virgin Mary. All that was best in Europe clustered around it, and it is the origin of many of the purest elements of our civilization." Not less eloquent is the testimony of John Ruskin : "After the most careful examination, neither as adversary nor as friend, of the influence of Catholicism for good and evil, I am persuaded that the worship of the Madonna has been one of its noblest and most vital graces, and has never been otherwise than productive of true holiness of life and purity of character. There has probably not been an innocent cottage home throughout the length and breadth of Europe during the whole period of vital Christianity, in which the imaged presence of the Madonna has not given sanctity to the humblest duties and comfort to the sorest trials of the lives of women ; and every brightest and loftiest achievement of the arts and strength of manhood has been the fulfilment of the assured prophecy of the Israelite maiden : He that is mighty hath done great things to me and holy is His Name."

The power of the Blessed Virgin with her divine Son shines forth in the record of His first public miracle.

"There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee ; and the Mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus also was invited, and His disciples, to the marriage. And the wine failing, the Mother of Jesus saith to Him, They have no wine. And Jesus saith to her : Woman, what is it to Me and to thee ? My hour is not yet come. His Mother saith to the waiters ; Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye. Now there were set there six water-pots of stone, according to the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three measures apiece. Jesus saith to them : Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And Jesus saith to them : Draw out now, and carry to the chief steward of the feast : and they carried it. And when the chief steward had tasted the water made wine, and knew not whence it was, but the waiters knew who had drawn the water ; the chief steward calleth the bridegroom, and saith to him : Every man at first setteth forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse : but thou hast kept the good wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee ; and manifested His glory, and His disciples believed in Him."—St. John ii, 1-11.

In their comment on the miracle of the changing of the water into wine at the marriage feast, the diminishers of the honor of Mary again display their malice. They seize upon the word "Woman" as though it were an insult. They do not know, or they conceal the fact, that in the original Greek it is a title of honor equivalent to "Lady." They quote the sentence "What is it to Me and to thee ?" with so much glee that one would think it creditable in Jesus to publicly snub His Mother. They twist, they distort, they disfigure the Sacred Text. Whereas the meaning of the inspired passage is written on its face. Mary knew her power with her Son. Though this is His first public miracle, He had doubtless worked many wonders for her in their holy home at Nazareth. On this occasion she would relieve the embarrassment of their host ; she had no misgiving regarding the readiness of Jesus to meet her desires, even though His hour had not yet come. And so, with sublime confidence, she said to the waiters : "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye." The one startling fact about the miracle of the marriage feast is that Jesus performed it before the opening of His public life, and outside the order of the divine economy, solely at the request and for

the sake of His Beloved Mother.

Even people in the crowds that surrounded Jesus during His public ministry and marvelled at his deeds, bore testimony to the dignity of His Mother, and Jesus enforces that testimony by declaring that the blessedness of His Mother was enhanced by her hearing the word of God and keeping it. St. Luke describes the occurrence :—

> " And it came to pass, as He (Jesus) spoke these things, a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to Him, Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, and the breasts that gave Thee suck. But He said : Yea rather, blessed are they who hear the Word of God, and keep it."—St. Luke xi. 27-28.

Mary who nursed Jesus in His cradle stands by Him at the foot of the cross. In that last supreme moment Mother and Son shall not be separated :

> " There stood by the Cross of Jesus, His Mother, and His Mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen. When Jesus therefore had seen His Mother and the disciple, standing, Whom He loved, He saith to His Mother, Woman, behold thy Son. After that, He saith to the disciple, Behold thy Mother. And from that hour the disciple took her to His own."—St. John xix. 25-27.

From the Cross upon which Jesus accomplished the work of man's redemption was Mary given to be the Mother of mankind. From the Cross we take her as our Mother. Misrepresentation and insult and slander cannot effect the relationship. They were, and are, the portion of her Divine Son ; they can only increase our love and our devotion when we see them applied to herself.

As we find Mary in the first book of the Old Testament, so does she appear likewise in the last book of the New. In Genesis we have the woman and her offspring and the serpent ; in the Apocalypse, the Mother and her Son and the dragon. The indistinct prophecy of future triumph foretold in the Old Testament becomes a picture of surpassing glory in the New.

> " A great sign appeared in Heaven : a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars ; and being with Child she cried travailing in birth and was in pain to be delivered. And there was seen another sign in Heaven ; and behold a great red dragon having seven heads, and ten horns : and on his head seven diadems,

and his tail drew the third part of the stars in Heaven, and cast them to the earth ; and the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, that he might devour her Son. And she brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron, and her Son was taken up to God and to His throne."—Apocalypse xii. 1-6.

Thus, beloved brethren, in the briefest way in which it could be done in keeping with the subject, and based solely on the words of Holy Writ, I have outlined the position of the Catholic Church with regard to the Blessed Virgin. To the Bible did they appeal when they attacked the Church on this question ? Dare they appeal to the Bible again ? Do they know their Bible ? If they do appeal to the Bible, there is not a non-Catholic who hears the charge, and who is present here tonight, who has not laid upon him the duty of refuting the charge ; who is not bound to say : — wait a moment ; I have heard this matter explained from a Catholic pulpit, and I have heard read from the Bible the very words upon which Catholics base their claim for this belief, and I think it well to examine it a little more closely before contemptuously rejecting it.

I have placed before you briefly and imperfectly the Bible picture of the Blessed Virgin Mary ; permit me to draw therefrom a few conclusions.* If the Incarnation of Jesus Christ is the sole fountain of blessings for all God's rational creatures, does it not seem reasonable that she in whom this stupendous mystery was actually accomplished should have received a fuller measure of these blessings than others who are far removed from it ?

If the Incarnation of Jesus is the sole hope of mankind for salvation,—and that is the foundation of Christianity,—does it not follow that she who was to be the Mother of God made man must have been superior to other women ? If to touch the hem of the garment of Jesus was sufficient to cure the sick, would she who held Him in her arms and caressed Him with her lips, not have been transfigured by so intimate a union ?

If at the sound of the voice of Jesus the winds were hushed, the waves were stilled, the dead arose, and the demons fled away, is it within the bounds of common sense that Mary could have listened to that voice for more than thirty years and not have thence derived spiritual blessings beyond the power of human thought to conceive ? If to look into the face of Jesus for one brief instant means salvation, — and that is what salvation is, and what each one of us is working for,—what shall we say of her who lovingly gazed for years upon the

* Summarized from "My Clerical Friends."

sacred countenance of Him Who was at once her Saviour and her Son ?

If the Precious Blood of Jesus shed on the Cross satisfied the justice of God and blotted out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, is it not a sublime reason for our love and reverence that this saving blood had its source in the heart of Mary, His Mother.

If Jesus was subject to Mary while on earth, and the Bible tells us that He was, does it not follow that He grants the requests she presents to Him in heaven as readily as He obeyed those which she addressed to Him on earth ?

If to be a servant of God will bring us glory such as eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath the heart of man conceived, what must be the glory of her, who was not His servant, but His Mother ?

The Bible picture takes us from the first book of the Old Testament, through the prophecies, through the psalms, to the New Testament, where we read of the Blessed Virgin Mary time after time, and see her always with her Divine Son. In the beginning, in the first pages of Genesis, there was a man, a woman and the serpent, and in the final book of the New Testament, there is a man, a woman and a dragon. The man is the Son of God, the woman is Mary and the dragon is the the devil. Always the Bible places Mary in this intimate association with Jesus in the divine scheme of the Redemption of the human race. Immeasurable the distance which separates them inasmuch as He is the Creator, she the creature ; He the Redeemer, she the redeemed. But impossible to conceive of a more intimate union since she is the Mother, He the Son.

We Catholics love and reverenee the Blessed Virgin Mary. For us she is supremely beautiful, the Queen of angels and of men, standing next to her Divine Son in the Kingdom of His glory and sympathizing with Him in the great work of the Redemption. Her very name arouses in our hearts the tenderest memories. It was she who showed us in childhood's years the little Jesus of the manger of Bethlehem. Almost the first prayer that we learned at our mother's knees was couched in the words the Angel and St. Elizabeth spoke to her : " Hail Mary full of grace the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus."

And when the shadows lengthen and the night comes on, may that same blessed Jesus enable us, if not with failing lips at least with faithful hearts, to utter, " Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and at the hour of our death. Amen."

CANON TUCKER REPLIES

To the Editor of The Advertiser :

It is charitable to think that Bishop Fallon's zeal for the practices of his Church ran away with his judgment, if his sermon is reported correctly in The Advertiser of this date.

I. Bishop Fallon knows very well that " hail," as addressed by the angel to the Blessed Virgin, is not a prayer. It is simply a salutation, and means " rejoice " or " be glad." The angel congratulates her upon the great favor bestowed upon her. The use of the word as a salutation is no warrant for its use as a prayer, nor does the passage in which it occurs suggest such a thought even remotely :

2. Then as to " special influence." Does the Bishop really mean to imply that the Son of God is amenable to " special influence," in his relation to mankind ? The Roman Catholic Church may assign to the Blessed Virgin such special influence with her Son ; but it does so against the whole tenor of the Scripture record, for on the few occasions recorded of her approaching Him during His public ministry, His answers were the opposite of encouraging to the idea of her possessing " special influence."

3. The most extraordinary statement, however, is the following : " The only difference between Jesus and Mary is that she was the creature, He the Creator ; she the redeemed and He the Redeemer, yet she was the Mother of Jesus." The only difference ! Can any difference be greater than that between the creature and the Creator, the redeemed and the Redeemer ? We pray to and worship only the Creator and Redeemer. According to the Bishop's own words, the Blessed Virgin is a " redeemed creature." Can the Bishop quote a single passage in the Bible where prayer and worship are to be addressed to a redeemed creature ? If not, is not all the Bishop's zealous eloquence mere words — camouflage, if you will, to hide the utter absence in the Scriptures of any warrant for the addressing of prayers to the Blessed Virgin ?

As there is not space to deal adequately with this large subject in a letter. I beg to state that I shall take the

opportunity, D. V., of preaching on the subject in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday evening next.

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, Feb. 10, 1919.

A REJOINDER OF BISHOP FALLON

To the Editor of The Advertiser :

In your issue of this date Canon Tucker attempts to draw a red herring across the track by making certain comments on my sermon of Sunday evening. I do not propose to allow him to so escape the issue raised by himself. On the 3rd instant, Canon Tucker was reported as having said in the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral on the day preceding "that the name of the Virgin was substituted for the name of Jesus Christ in the Te Deum and other services of the Catholic Church."

In a public letter of the 4th instant I characterized that statement as "absolutely false and without any foundation in fact." On the same day Canon Tucker repeated his slander in the following terms : "Leaders of the Catholic Church have been promoting the glories of Mary and ascribing to her the attributes of Christ Himself. . . . In societies interested in promoting beliefs in her glories, her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum for the name of Christ." On the 5th instant I publicly called upon Canon Tucker "to show proofs for his indefensible distortions of facts that are within the reach of all."

There the issue still stands ; Canon Tucker desires to evade it ; he has not accepted the challenge ; he has not produced the proofs. The charge he made is clear and intelligible : it can be established by producing the Psalms and the Te Deum in which the name of the Virgin Mary has been substituted for that of Christ. Until Canon Tucker produces those proofs or publicly admits that he cannot do so, no other performance of his is worthy the attention of an honest man.

Yours faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,

Feb. 11, 1919. Bishop of London.

CANON TUCKER'S SERMON

In order to be quite fair to Canon Tucker, we give below the substance of his sermon as it is reported in the London Advertiser of Feb. 17, 1919.

Replying in his evening sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday to the challenge of Bishop Fallon regarding the position accorded the Virgin Mary in the Bible, Rev. Dr. N. L. Tucker, the rector, stated that he was not dealing in personalities, but in principles and doctrines. Since the situation had arisen in which he was obliged to make a reply, "it seems to me," said Dr. Tucker, "that the contestants should observe the simplest rules of politeness and the ordinary amenities of civilized life. God forbid that there should be failure to observe the law of brotherhood.

"Nevertheless, loyalty to conscience obliges me to speak plainly.

"I have received so much kindness in this city, in Toronto and throughout the Dominion that I would have it known that I am not a man to speak without knowledge and without authority. I am not a man to make false accusations and run away to avoid the consequences."

SERMON STARTED IT

Calling attention to the circumstance which had brought about the controversy, "and is responsible for this large congregation to night," Dr. Tucker continued, 'I have been made the unwilling occasion of a ripple in the religious life of the community because of a sermon which I preached on the second of February, forty days after Christmas, and of which a report was given to the paper more or less correctly by someone present in the congregation.

"Forty days after the birth of Christ, the Blessed Virgin went up to the temple to present her Son taking with her two turtle doves for her own purification. Since Christmas falls on the 25th of December, the fortieth day after Christmas was the second of February. Following my custom, I took occasion to preach on the subject for the day and to give simple instruction to my own congregation in regard to the relation of the Blessed Virgin

to her Divine Son. From what I have since heard, there was need of such instruction. Members of St. Paul's parish, I have since learned, had believed that the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin and of our Lord and Saviour were the same.

"I courted no publicity, attacked no one, and made no reference to the Roman Catholic Church. It is a serious matter if a minister of the gospel is not free to instruct his own people. If not, where is there freedom of worship and of religion ?"

REITERATED STATEMENT

Reiterating his statement, which Bishop Fallon had challenged, that the name of the Blessed Virgin had been substituted for that of God and Christ in a psalter for devotional uses and in the Te Deum, the preacher submitted his proof, the writings of eminent theologians. Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D. D., Vicar of Bridlington, Yorks, in the "Manual of Romanish Controversy" was quoted as follows :

"Mary is called the Queen of Heaven and praises which belong only to the Divine Being are ascribed to her. St. Bonaventure, called the seraphic doctor, published a "Psalter of the Virgin," which was in part the psalms of David, with the name of Mary substituted for that of God. The author of these pages has before him an edition of this psalter, published in Rome in the year 1834, with the imprimatur of the Roman authorities. The following are specimens of the work :

Psalm I.—

"'Blessed is the Man that loveth thy name, Virgin Mary. As a fertile spot moistened by water streams, thou shalt plant in him the fruit of righteousness," etc.

Psalm II.—

"'Why do our enemies rage and imagine vain things against us ? Let thy right hand protect us. Mother of God, as a terrible sword confounding and destroying them. Come until her, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and she will give rest unto your souls."

Psalm III.—

" 'Lady, how are they increased that trouble me ; in thy wrath shalt thou persecute and scatter them. Have mercy upon me, O Lady, and heal my infirmity. Support my soul in the day of death.'

Hymn similar to Te Deum Laudamus—

" 'We praise thee, Mother of God. We acknowledge thee, Virgin Mary. All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the Everlasting Father, holy. holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God ; the Mother of a Divine Majesty.'

Creed like that of Athanasius —

" Whoever will be saved before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith about Mary."

Extract from the Virgin's Looking Glass : —

" 'She is, in truth, the ruler of things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, ruler, I say, of angels, ruler of men, ruler of demons, ruler of each in heaven, ruler in the world, ruler in hell."

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Charles Hardwick, M. A., formerly Fellow of St. Catharine College, and Archdeacon of Ely, was another authority quoted, the following being repeated by Dr. Tucker from the church history of the middle ages, A. D. 1073-305 ; "The parallel which was established at this time between the honors rendered to St. Mary and to God Himself, is a distressing proof that in the estimation of her purest votaries she was invested with the prerogatives belonging only to her Son."

Other authorities quoted by Dr. Tucker were Henry Hart Milman, D. D., dean of St. Paul's, in his History of Latin Christianity ; Richard Chenevix Trench, Archbishop of Dublin, in Mediæval Church History ; John Ewall, Bishop of Salisbury. and William Fulke, D. D. Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, who wrote : " I have seen that horrible, blasphemous psalter of Bonaventure, perverting all the psalms into the honor of the Virgin Mary."

John Bradford, martyred in 1555, wrote : " The parody also on the Book of Psalms, attributed to Bonaventure (in which the implications and praises originally addressed to the Most High are blasphemously transferred to the Virgin), was called the Lady's Psalter.' "

Dr. Tucker's contention that the Roman Catholic has accorded the Virgin Mary a place not given to her in scriptures, was supported by quotation from and reference to the Bible. In this connection, he quoted Article 6 of the Church of England, which specially states that the appeal of the Church is to Holy Scripture and that it stands on the word of God and nothing else.

CHURCH PAYS HONOR

The Church of England, he declared, pays respect and honor to the Blessed Virgin, and two feast days of the year are dedicated to her. But it gives worship to Christ and to God alone.

"Two things stand out prominently in the Old Testament," he said, "the jealousy of God for his honor and the inveterate tendency of the Jews, the tendency of human nature, to continually seek to worship other gods, God declared He would have no other gods, before Him. This was meant to correct the abuses that had crept in through the influence of the worship of neighboring people.

"The children of Israel worshipped the golden calf; later a relic brought with them from their wilderness journey, the brazen serpent. Before they departed as captives to Babylon they burnt incense to the Queen of Heaven. The Queen of Heaven is only mentioned in the Bible by Jeremiah, and only in relation to a heathen divinity. . . .

"The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary," he continued: "the doctrine that she was born, lived and died without sin, dated back definitely to the 8th of December, 1854, when this was announced by Pope Pius IX.

It makes one begin to question when one hears the the phrases in Latin 'always the same' and 'unchanging'" said the preacher, adding, "If the Immaculate Conception of Mary was found in the words of our Lord, why were 1,800 years allowed to pass before it was put definitely in doctrine? Why did Dominicans contest this dogma for many years? Why did St. Thomas Aquinus, greatest of scholars writing 600 years ago, deny it? Why was no reference made to it, in the public teachings and writing of the apostles?

" RESPECT NOT WORSHIP "

" Though highly favored, the Virgin Mary was not full of grace. That belonged to Christ alone. Mary is 'blessed among women,' not 'above' women. Jael, who by her patriotic act delivered her people, was accorded the title Blessed among women.'

" We bow with gratitude to God that Mary was the first to see the mission Jesus had come to perform.

" When she received the great message from the angel she placed herself in the hands of God to carry out His will. We do not fail to pay her proper respect

" But respect is not worship."

Dr. Tucker drew attention to the manner in which Jesus Himself discriminated between the divine and human relation. He was the obedient, devoted Son of of His parents, but in the temple He recognized a higher obedience to His mission.

At Cana of Galilee Dr. Tucker maintained that Jesus performed the miracle, not in obedience to His Mother, but, placing the divine relationship as higher than all others.

" The Bible definitely says : 'All we, like sheep, have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the inquiry of us all ;" and 'there is no other name under heaven given amongst men whereby we must be saved,' " quoted the pastor.

NAME NOT MENTIONED

" Jesus called Himself the door, the way, the bread of life, but not one syllable regarding the office or person of the Blessed Virgin. If she occupied so large and important a place in the Christian economy surely her name would have been mentioned in the teachings of three years, or by Paul, the greatest theologian of all the ages. The Apostles' Creed contains no mention of the Virgin Mary beyond the fact that the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary. In the year 325, when the Nicean creed was drawn up to rout heresies, the same was true of it as the Apostles' Creed, and also of the Athanasian creed 500 years after ?

" How explain the Queen of Heaven, refuge of sinners ?

" We do not need the intervention of the Virgin Mary. The Lord took all for us and completed our redemption,

He is able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto Him.

"He is our compassionate high priest, exercising right now his priestly office at the right hand of God.

"More, the love of God has been likened to the love of a father for his son. The objection that a father is not so gentle or so tender as woman's love, is met in the words, "Can a woman forget her child, the son of her womb? Yes, she may forget. I can never forget.' God is all sufficient, all compassion Himself, according to the teachings of His own word.

"In preaching, I seek to extend the kingdom of God to men, the kingdom of spiritual religion."

THE CANON'S IDEA OF CONTROVERSIAL "AUTHORITY." CONFLICT OF STATEMENTS

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

A rather lengthy absence from the city has prevented me from giving earlier attention to the attempt made by Canon Tucker in St. Paul's Cathedral on February 16th to justify the grave charges which I had asked him either to substantiate or to withdraw.

In an effort to escape responsibility for having aroused religious controversy in our midst, Canon Tucker makes this amazing statement:

"I courted no publicity, attacked no one, and made no reference to the Roman Catholic Church. It is a serious matter if a minister of the Gospel is not free to instruct his own people. If not, where is there freedom of worship and of religion?"

The above statement is at direct variance with facts of public record.

On February 3, Canon Tucker was reported in The Advertiser as having declared that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was "the greatest aberration in the history of Christendom," and that "the name of the Virgin was substituted for the name of Jesus Christ in the Te Deum and other services of the Catholic Church."

On February 4, Canon Tucker authorized the publication of the following statement:

" Canon Tucker declares that he did say that the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the early Church, and was the greatest aberration in the history of Christianity ; and that in societies interested in promoting beliefs in her glories, her name had been substituted in psalms and in the Te Deum."

The Advertiser asserted its belief that there was " no substantial difference between what was reported to have been said by Canon Tucker and his own version of his sermon." And in both The Advertiser's report and in Canon Tucker's own version there is a direct reference to the Catholic Church, and an attack on the beliefs of every Catholic.

I then challenged Canon Tucker " to show proofs for his indefensible distortion of facts that are within the reach of all." What proofs has Canon Tucker produced ? With a second-hand scholarship of which he should be ashamed, and which is far from establishing his boastful claim that he is " not a man to speak without knowledge and without authority, or to make false accusations and run away to avoid the consequences," the Canon brings forth a book entitled " Manual of Romanish Controversy," written by a Protestant minister named Rev. R. P. Blakeney. Does Canon Tucker not understand that the authority of the Rev. R. P. Blakeney is no better than his own ? Can he fail to realize that such testimony would not be accepted by any court in the land ? And the same criticism applies to every other authority adduced by Canon Tucker. He might as well have offered as evidence against the Catholic Church " The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," or the files of the Orange Sentinel. If it is for that kind of abuse that the Canon claims " freedom of worship and of religion," I have no desire to deprive him of any scrap of honor or of enjoyment that may accompany such an occupation. And if his people find instruction in such abuse of the Catholic Church, I shall raise no objection so long as the performance is kept behind closed doors. But if, and whenever, it is reported in the public press, I shall assert the right of pinning the Canon down to proofs. I may be met, as in the present instance, by

only shiftiness and evasion. But at length I shall hope to show Canon Tucker in his true colors. For the Canon appears to have an itch for baseless misrepresentation. I have caught him at it before.* Two years ago he publicly asserted that " Bishop Fallon announced a year ago there was no salvation for anyone outside the Romish Church." As a result of my private request that the Canon inform me when and where I had used such language, he published a half-hearted retractation in which he expressed regret " if he misunderstood my words." Whereas the fact was that I had never used words susceptible of any such interpretation, nor could Canon Tucker find in the public press to which he appealed any semblance of justifieation for the charge he had so impudently made, but which he had neither the manliness nor the sense of public decency to withdraw unreservedly.

Canon Tueker's misrepresentation and misinterpretation of the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary recalls the amusing story of a Russian nobleman who was reported to have made a violent attack in Moscow on the British sovereign and the British constitution. This " foreign potentate," having asserted that the tenets of the British constitution were " atheistical !" and its maxims "fiendish," was called upon for proof. Whereupon, with an air of triumph that was intended to be overwhelming, he quoted from Blackstone's " Commentaries on the Laws of England." And this is what he read ; " The King can do no wrong. In his political capacity there is ascribed to the King absolute perfection. The King is not only incapable of doing wrong, but even of thinking wrong ; he can never do an improper thing ; in him is no folly or weakness." To make his case complete, the Russian cited Addison's line on Queen Anne ; " Thee, Goddess, thee Britannia's Isle Adores," And then, with an exultant shriek, he cried out : " Was I not right, my dear compatriots, in using the words fiendish and atheistical with regard to the British sovereign and the British constitution ?" To all of which, of course, there was but one reply : That the fiery orator, either in ignorance or in malice, had distorted and misrepresented Blackstone and Addison.

* See Page 50.—"Some Correspondence."

Canon Tucker is the local counterpart of the Russian nobleman.

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, March 1, 1919.

CANON INSISTS "ROMANISH CONTROVERSY" IS AUTHORITATIVE HISTORY

To the Editor of The Free Press :

Dear Sir :—Bishop Fallon must have a very poor opinion of the intelligence of the people of London when he imagines that with a mere stroke of the pen he can rule out of court, as unworthy of credence, some of the best historians and writers of the nineteenth century. And it is precisely in a court of law that those distinguished names would carry weight ; for I did not cite them as exponents of Roman doctrine, though even thus they are not to be lightly esteemed, but as witnesses to a fact. I stated what I thought to be a fact. Bishop Fallon denied it. I produced those witnesses to establish the fact. Dr. Blakeney, e. g., says, " the author of these pages has before him an edition of this Psalter of the Virgin, published in Rome in the year 1834, with the imprimatur of the Roman authorities." This is not a question of the truth or falsehood of Roman doctrine, but a simple question of fact. Either Dr. Blakeney had before him a copy of this Psalter or he had not. If he had, all Bishop Fallon's words are but empty sounds. If he had not, he convicts himself as a deliberate and wilful liar. It will take more than Bishop Fallon's mere ipse dixit to place in that category such men as Archbishop Trench and Dean Milman.

Then Bishop Fallon recalls an incident that occurred two years ago and adds, " the Canon appears to have an itch for baseless misrepresentation. I have caught him at it before." It was at the time when Father Richards was reported to have made the statement that " marriage by the Anglican Church or by any other denomination of the Protestant church is no marriage at all in the sight of God." In the course of an interview with the press on the subject, I attributed to Bishop Fallon from the report of a sermon preached by him some time before, the statement, " outside the Roman Catholic Church there is

no salvation." My statement, however, appeared in The Press in the following form : " There is no salvation for anyone outside the Romish Church." To this statement Bishop Fallon objected. This led to a correspondence which will serve to establish the facts of the case.

1. It was not my words which the bishop objected to, but those of the reporter. On December 12, 1916, I wrote to the bishop, saying, " The item was the result of an interview over the telephone. I am not responsible for the wording of the report." To this the bishop replied, December 14 : " I accept without reserve your denial of responsibility for the wording of the report." It is on the strength of that report that the bishop now charges me with " baseless misrepresentation." The charge lies at his own door.

2. My statement was : " Outside the Roman Catholic Church there is no salvatiou." This may be proven by a letter which I addressed to The Press on December 18, 1916. What does the correspondence reveal ? On December 19 the bishop wrote : " Outside the Church there is no salvation, rightly understood and correctly explained, is an undeniable Christian truth." On December 31 he further wrote. " Of course, in Catholic teaching, outside the Church there is no salvation and outside the Church Catholic, Apostolic and Roman there is no salvation, are identical propositions. By church I mean the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church." Hence, the bishop's doctrine is identical with that which I attributed to him. Where then is the baseless misrepresentation ? A tree is known by its fruit. If such doctrine produces the bearing and manners of Bishop Fallon, who would care to be a bishop of the one and only Church ?

3. A curious incident occurred in that correspondence In a letter to the bishop on December 17, I alluded to my experience in the Province of Quebec, where I had seen catechisms sanctioned and taught by the Roman Catholic authorities, which contained the words in French, " outside the Church Catholic, Apostolic and Roman there is no salvation." On December 19 the bishop replied : " I have never met the formula, etc., in any manual of Catholic

doctrine." I sent the bishop, forthwith, two catechisms which contained the statement in full. I had thus the opportunity of teaching Bishop Fallon something regarding his own Church which he never knew before, and he returns the compliment by saying that my ignorance of the teaching of his Church is " colossal."

I am, yours most truly,

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

The Rectory, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Ont.,
March 10, 1919.

BISHOP INSISTS ON PROOF. GARBLED LETTERS TO BE PUBLISHED

To The Editor of The Free Press :

I consider that Canon Tucker, in his latest communication to you, has garbled the contents and distorted the meaning of certain letters that passed between him and me some two years ago. In consequence I have asked his consent to the publication of the entire correspondence. As it is too lengthy to expect that it should be given space in the columns of the daily press, I propose to issue and circulate it in pamphlet form and let it speak for itself. *

Some weeks ago Canon Tucker stated that " the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible," that " leaders of the Catholic Church have been ascribing to her the attributes of Christ Himself," and that " her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum for the name of Christ."

Canon Tucker thereby revived the old slander and calumny that the Catholic Church gives supreme honor or divine worship to the Virgin Mary. If he did not mean that, then what possible purpose could his words serve ? If he did not mean that, what did he mean ? And if he did mean to charge Catholics with idolatry, then it would have been the part of honesty for him to have said so frankly. How he has been understood is well illustrated by a correspondent who signs himself " Onlooker," and who refers to Canon Tucker's charges as representing " what is commonly known by those outside the Roman

* See Page 50.

Church as mariolatry." Did Canon Tucker really mean to accuse Catholics of mariolatry ?

When I requested Canon Tucker to substantiate his statements, I naturally expected him to produce proofs from Catholic sources. We have our authentic and authorized catechisms, prayer books, missals breviaries, doctrinal treatises, work of devotion and books of liturgy. They are to be found by the hundred here in the City of London, where Canon Tucker's charge has been publicly made. All the services in Catholic churches are open ; we welcome inquiry and are ever ready to explain our doctrines. We claim. perhaps not unnaturally, that we know our beliefs better than those who are strangers to the Catholic faith ; we object, perhaps not without reason, to have Protestant writers offered as authorities on Catholic teaching.

In answer to my challenge, what course did Canon Tucker pursue ? Did he offer as justification or proof one iota of Catholic teaching ? Most assuredly not. He produced a book written in 1834, by a Protestant minister, and the very title of which, " Manual of Romanish Controversy," would render its contents suspect to any fair-minded man. In point of fact and law such testimony is inadmissible in any court ; it is precisely equivalent to hearsay evidence. The addition of the names of Milman, Trench and others does not add a particle of strength to the argument. The only competent evidence is authentic Catholic doctrine. That evidence Canon Tucker has not produced, and cannot produce. And hence I repeat my accusation that he has made baseless charges and has misrepresented and distorted Catholic teaching.

Let me submit to Canon Tucker and to your readers a parallel case. A London newspaper, let us suppose, quotes Bishop Fallon as having said in St. Peter's Cathedral ; " It would not be considered heresy in the Church of England for the Archbishop of Canterbury to deny the existence of God."

Canon Tucker at once vigorously protests and calls upon me to prove so monstrous a charge. Instead of referring to the recognized doctrinal formularies of the Anglican church, I produce a book entitled "The Comedy

of Convocation," written in 1834 by A. F. Marshall, a graduate of Cambridge ; and from it I quote " We find that the Church of England is not opposed to the existence of a God. At the same time, we cannot overlook the fact that the nineteenth article, in affirming that all churches, even the apostolic, have erred in matters of faith, obviously implies that the Church of England may err in teaching that there is a God. We conclude that whilst, on the one hand, the Archbishop has taken an extreme or one-sided view of the teaching of the Church ; on the other, for the reason assigned, it is undoubtedly open to every Anglican clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of a God."

What would Canon Tucker think of my controversial decency and honesty ? " The Comedy of Convocation " is a satirical attack on the Church of England. Its author is a convert from Anglicanism to the Catholic Church. Would Canon Tucker consider him a competent witness ? Is his testimony admissible on a point of doctrine of the Church of England ? Or is it only the Catholic Church against which such untruthful, unfair and shameful controversial methods may be used with impunity ?

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, March 14, 1919.

THE CANON SUMMONS ROBERT E. SPEER AS WITNESS

To The Editor of The Free Press :

Bishop Fallon may be a very great prelate. He certainly is a mighty poor logician, unless, indeed, as " Onlooker " says, he merely wishes to throw dust in people's eyes.

I quoted an accurate and serious author, Dr. Blakeney, who says in effect, I hold in my hands a Roman Catholic Psalter, published in Rome in 1834, with the imprimator of the papal authorities, with the name of the Virgin substituted for that of God, and I quoted as corroborative evidence Archbishop Trench, Dean Milman, Archdeacon Harwicke and others.

How does Bishop Fallon meet this? He says, let me submit a parallel case. He then proceeds to quote a facetious graduate of Cambridge, A F. Marshall by name, who writes a satirical attack on the Church of England, entitled "The Comedy of Convocation," and concludes with the words, "It is undoubtedly open to every (Anglican) clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of God." By the same process of reasoning this would be equally true of every Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist minister.

Let me point out to Bishop Fallon that this is by no means a parallel case. To make it a parallel case the bishop would have to quote not a satirical comedian, but John Henry Newman or some other serious Roman Catholic author, not as giving his own views, but as saying, "I hold in my hand a Church of England book, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, with the the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which contains the following statement. 'It is undoubtedly open to every clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of God,' and that he supported this with the corroboration of Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Vaughan. There would be a strong presumption, not to say a certainty, that such a book existed and that it represented, in some measure, the teachings of the Church of England. This would be not only a parallel case, but a very strong and perfectly legitimate argument. In the other case, to be very frank, I think as little of Bishop Fallon's "controversial decency and honesty" as I think of his logic.

The bishop asks me if I really mean to accuse Roman Catholics of mariolatry. I have no desire to use the word if it be offensive. But let me again quote a serious writer, Rev. Robert E. Speer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world to-day. Dr. Speer spent months in investigating conditions in South America, where he studied all classes and conditions of men and institutions. He calls South America a Roman Catholic continent, where Protestantism is nonexistent practically and where the Roman Catholic Church has held undisputed sway for three centuries. After describing the deplorable moral condition

that widely prevails among priests and people alike, in a book entitled "South American Problems," he mentions one of the causes as follows: "The great mass of South American people have not been given Christianity. The very crucifixes of which South America is full misrepresent the Gospel. They show a dead man, not a living Saviour. And even the dead Christ in a subordinate figure. The central place is Mary's. Mary is the central religious person. She, as Bishop Romero declared in the Argentine congress on December 31, 1901, for all Catholics is the center of piety and virtue in the family circle. Mary, not Christ. And Mariolatry is the religion of the land because the Church has taught it as true Christianity. When on Good Friday morning, 1910, the two processions bearing the images of Mary and Jesus moved out of the church of San Nicola, in Barranquilla, the multitude followed the figure of Mary and the figure of the Saviour was deserted. The popular religion of South America accepts the view of Mary, which is set forth in St. Alphonsus Ligouri's "Glories of Mary"—if Jesus is the King of the universe, Mary is also its queen, and, as queen, she possesses, by right, the whole kingdom of her son. Hence as many creatures as there are who serve God, so many there are who serve Mary. For as angels and men and all things that are in heaven and on earth are subject to the Empire of God, so are they also under the dominion of Mary. In the great La Merced Church, in Lima, over the chancel is the motto. "Gloria a Maria." And in the wall of the ancient Jesuit church of Cuzio, known as the Church of the Campania, are cut the words, "Come unto Mary all ye who are burdened and weary with your sins and she will give you rest."

It would seem that Mariolatry is not too strong a word to qualify such a state of things.

I am, yours most truly,

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

The Rectory, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, March 17, 1919.

WITH SPURIOUS PSALTER AND FORGED ENCYCLICAL CANON IS LEFT IN BAD COMPANY

To the Editor, of The Free Press :

After squirming for six weeks Canon Tucker finally admits that the charge he leveled against Catholics in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 3rd of February last, was idolatry. For mariolatry and idolatry are synonymous terms. Being a gentleman, of course it hurts Canon Tucker to use the word "if it be offensive," but as a dignitary of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, he must instruct his congregation, and "it would seem that mariolatry is not too strong a word" to impart such instruction. Too polite to libel an individual Catholic, yet Canon Tucker does not consider it bad manners to slander them in bulk. And to justify his weird notion of "instruction," he invokes the principle of freedom of speech. "If," asks Canon Tucker "a minister of religion is not free to instruct his congregation on religious matters, where then is freedom of speech, of teaching or of worship ?" The obligation not to bear false witness is, to say the least, as sacred as the principle of freedom of speech. That obligation Canon Tucker has shamelessly violated.

Now that Canon Tucker has accused Catholics of being idolaters, let us examine the basis upon which he rests so foul a charge. His first argument is drawn from a book, "Manual of Romanish Controversy," by Rev. R. P. Blakeney, a Protestant minister, whom Canon Tucker canonizes as "an accurate and serious author." Dr. Blakeney quotes from a "Psalter of Mary," by St. Bonaventure. The British Museum Catalogue, an authority that even Canon Tucker will scarcely question, characterizes this alleged "Psalter of Mary" as "spurious." Your readers may choose between Canon Tucker on the one hand and the British Museum Catalogue on the other.

In his dash to South America Canon Tucker is still more unfortunate. In this case his faithful navigator is again another Protestant minister, the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom he vouches for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world to-day." Permit me to throw a little light on the reliability of this "outstanding figure."

On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnatti, on "Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America." This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester N. Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop

of Santiago, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. to the clergy of Chile. It took more than two years to force the Rev. Robert E. Speer to acknowledge that the documents he had used were forgeries. On October 18, 1910, this "outstsnding figure in the religious world" was informed that Rome had pronounced the Encyclical in question "a palpable fraud and forgery," and that the Archbishop of Santiago had styled his alleged pastoral "a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud." It was only on the 30th of April, 1912, that Rev. Robert E. Speer, in a letter over his own signature, admitted the forgery. He made no apology for his unspeakable offense, but with a callous disregard for decency, expressed his pleasure that "the matter had been definitely settled, not only by the statement of the secretary of the archbishop, but also by the acknowledgment on the part of the original inventor." Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent.

Thus the latest charge of mariolatry against Catholics rests on the authority of the Rev. W. P. Blakeney, who makes use of a "spurious" work; of the Rev. Robert E. Speer, a circulator of "a palpable forgery, a wicked and vile calumny, a coarse fraud," and of the Rev. L. Norman Tucker, Canon of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral.

An equally indefensible and similiarily baseless falsehood was exposed some years ago by the late Cardinal Newman. On that occasion the culprit was also a minister of the Church of England. He had been on a visit to Belgium, and, on his return, made the following declaration which was reported in the London Times in June, 1851: "On my visit to Brussels I was led to inspect the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral; I saw fastened up there a catalogue of sins, with a specification of the prices at which remission of each might severally be obtained." On investigation it was found that there was indeed a catalogue fastened to the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral. The inscription translated ran as follows: 'A chair without cushion, one cent; a chair with cushion, two cents. On great festival days, a chair without cushion, two cents; a chair with cushion, four cents.'

It is not on record that either the London Times or the Anglican minster made an apology. It looks as though Canon Tucker was running true to form.

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

P. S.—Would it be an indiscretion to request the anonymous

letter writers "Onlooker," and "Bystander" to reveal their real identity ? Their style and matter arouse my curiosity and suspicion.

London, March 20, 1919.

CANON TUCKER WRITES MUCH, BUT NOT ABOUT BLAKENEY AND SPEER

To The Editor of the Free Press :

Bishop Fallon at length admits that there is such a book as the Psalter of tbe Virgin. It follows that my statement was not a "baseless misrepresentation." It had at least the basis of this Psalter. And it is entirely in keeping with the inscription on the walls of the Jesuit church in Cuzco, South America, "Come unto Mary all ye who are burdened and weary with your sins and she will give you rest," where the name of Mary has been palpably substituted for that of Christ. It is also in keeping with the teachings of that standing work, "The Devotions of the Sacred Heart." The Church gives Mary titles which resemble those given to her divine Son. Jesus is our King ; Mary is our Queen ; Jesus is our advocate and mediator ; Mary is also our advocate and mediatrix. Jesus is our hope, our refuge, our consolation ; we say the same of Mary, Jesus is the way that leads to heaven ; Mary is the gate of heaven."

But the Bishop triumphantly adds that the book is "spurious," on the authority of the catalogue of the British Museum. This is once more throwing dust in people's eyes, for the word "spurious" in literature only means that a work was not written by the person to whom it is attributed. I am not at variance with the catalogue, for in my sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral I quoted Archbishop Trench as saying : "A profane traversty of the Psalter, some times ascribed to Bonaventure, is not the work of the Seraphic doctor." However discreditable this may be the book was, nevertheless, published in Rome in 1834, with the imprimatur of the papal authorities. How does Bishop Fallon account for such honorable treatment in such high quarters ?

Bonaventure lived about 1250 A. D. He was a man of intense devotion, which won for him the title of "Seraphic Doctor." His devotion, in keeping with the spirit of times, ran largely in the direction of the Virgin Mary. Out of that spirit of the times arose also the scapular, the rosary, the speculum, the mariate and this Psalter of the Virgin. It could not have been a Protestant fabrication, for it was written

hundreds of years before the Reformation. Hardwick attributes it to the purest votaries of Mary. William Fulke, D. D., master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, about 1555, A. D., says it was written in honor of the Virgin. Its source is Roman whoever the author may be. Archbishop Trench says it was a favorite book of devotion in these ages. Following the common practice of claiming authority under venerable names it was ascribed to Bonaventure. It was printed as his work in London in 1555, and in Paris in 1618 and 1647. A critical examination in resent days has led to the conclusion that it was not written by Bonaventure. But it remains the production of the votaries of Mary, published and used in her honor.

But this Psalter is only a very small part of a very large subject. The worship of the Virgin Mary finds no sanction in the Bible, but, on the contrary, is opposed to its teachings. The title, Queen of Heaven, is used only in Jeremiah, and that only in connection with idolatrous worship, in which the devotees offered cakes as a sacrifice. Not even the remotest allusion is made to her by St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, St. James and St. Jude ; except aa to her human relation to Jesus she has no place in the Catholic creeds. She is not even mentioned by St. Barnabas, St. Hermas, St. Clement, of Rome, St. Polycarp, Tatain, Athenagoras, Theophilus St. Hippolytus, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, St. Dionysius, Arnobius and St. Methodius. See Littledale's Plain Reasons.

About the end of the 4th century, however, the leaven of error began to work. A small company of devotees of Mary, chiefly women, called Collyridians because they offered cakes, (collyria), to the Blessed Virgin, gave currency to the fable of the Assumption. According to them, after her son's death. Mary was wafted in a cloud from her home in Bethlelem to Jerusalem, where the Apostles were miraculously gathered together, and there her soul was taken up into Paradise by Gabriel. But lest her body should see corruption, her Son, Christ, appeared and reunited it with her soul and caused her to be conveyed by angels to heaven. Down to the end of the 5th century this story was regarded as a Gnostic or Collyridian fable and was condemned as heretical by a decree attributed to Pope Gelasius. A. D., 494. In consequence of a change of sentiment during later centuries, it was introduced into the Church by a series of successful forgeries. There is the clearest evidence that no one within the Church taught it for six centuries and that those who did teach it in the church borrowed it directly from a book condemned as heretical by

Pope Gelasius. Readers may be left to draw their own conclusions. See Smith & Cheetham's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

In like manner the Immaculate Conception finds no place in the Bible, but is contrary to its teachings. It finds no place in the teachings of the primitive church. Gibbon states that it was borrowed from the teachings of Mahommed. From Apostolic times to the end of the 5th century it was taught and believed that Mary was born in original sin, that she was liable to actual sin and that she fell into sins of infirmity. Even as late as the 13th century it was taught and believed that she was conceived in sin and so subject to original sin. The doctrine was opposed by St. Bernard, the last of the fathers, St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of the school men and the powerful order of the Dominicans. From the 14th to the 18th century teaching and belief in the Latin church wavered between the Maculate and the Immaculate Conception, Even in the 19th century Milner, in his "End of Controversy," said: "The Church leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it." And yet, as a result of the teachings of Bonaventure, the rosary, the miracle of our "spurious" Psalter of the Virgin, et id genus omme, the Roman Church was prepared to accept the doctrine as promulgated by Pope Pius IX., in 1854.

Dr. Littledale does not shrink from calling certain practices in Rome itself, in the churches of Ste. Marie del Divino, Ara Caeli and Sta. Marie, in Cosmedin, "idolatry in the strict sense of the word." Many sober historians and theologians have called this mariolatry. I have ventured to call it the greatest aberration in the history of the Christian Church.

My time and your space and possibly even the patience of your readers are exhausted. I shall ask the favor of dealing with the case of Dr. Speer another time.

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, March 24, 1919.

MUCH WRITING. VERY LITTLE SPEER

Editor of the Free Press: A layman of Chile, presumably a Roman Catholic, forged a long letter purporting to be addressed by Pope Leo XIII. to the prelates of Chile, containing a terrible arraingment of the archbishop and clergy of the country. This letter was published on October 24th, 1897, in one of the ablest newspapers in the land. On December 5th, 1897, the same paper published what purported to be the

archbishop's reply, issued under his seal. Extracts from these letters were published in magazines in Germany, England and the United States and a paragraph from the alleged letter of the pope was printed in half a dozen different books. And yet these seem to have never been called in question. On a visit to South America, Dr. Speer came across these publications and in all good faith, thinking they were genuine, quoted from them on his return at a conference held in Rochester in 1909. They were at once challenged and Dr. Speer instituted a thorough investigation. After a search extending over more than one year he not only ascertained that they were false, but succeeded in unearthing the culprit, who merely laughed at the matter as a huge joke. Dr. Speer then published the result of his investigation and expressed regret for the part he had taken in the matter. This is the sum and substance of the incident that won for Dr. Speer the gracious and delicate attentions of Bishop Fallon.

The bishop has indeed no reason to think too kindly of Dr. Speer for he has drawn a most shocking picture of the moral conditions of South America. He gladly acknowledges the many winning qualities and artistic tastes of the people and predicts a great future for the country if the evils that are sapping its strength can be eradicated. He cannot absolve the Roman Catholic Church from all blame in the matter for it is practically the only religious institution in the land and has held undisputed sway for 300 years. In the matter of education, while great progress is being made, the rank and file of the people are illiterate. In morals the country is rotten to the core, one main source of the corruption being the priesthood itself. The church is resolutely opposed to freedom of worship and is reported by Professor Monteverde, of the University of Uraguay, as prefering clubs of infidels to Protestant churches. It is equally opposed to civil marriage and as a result there are whole towns in certain districts where there is not, nor has there ever been a marriage. A large proportion of the children are illegitimate. And as to religion, Brazil has no longer any faith; statesmen, lawyers, physicians, army and naval officials have almost to a man turned to infidelity. Porte Rico is a Roman Catholic country without religion; only Satan would call Central America Christian. No wonder that Dr. Speer is a witness who must be discredited at all costs. But Dr. Speer quotes a vast mass of evidence from the tongue and pen of priests, authors, travelers, professors and representatives of the American Government, and only in the case of these forged

letters has his testimony been shaken.

Now, to the ordinary mortal, it would seem that the real culprit in this case is the forger and not Dr. Speer, who was deceived by the forgery. Why does Bishop Fallon use his bludgeon on Dr. Speer and let the real culprit off scot free? Can it be the guilty consciousness that the papal power is too much indebted to successful forgery to allow him to cudgel his best friends.

At the close of the eighth century an advocate of the papal power forged two sets of documents, which he ascribed to Isidore, of Seville, as the Psalter of the Virgin, was ascribed to Bonaventure. The one was the donation of Constantine and was introduced to the world by Pope Adrian 1st, who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality of the great Constantine. This has become one of the main pillars of the temporal power of the Pope. The other was the false decretals, one of the mightiest engines in the triumphs of the papacy, which consisted of 59 false letters and decrees of the 20 oldest popes and 39 false decrees and acts of several unauthentic councils. It is impossible to deny that the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud which, for 600 years, imposed on the ignorance and credulity of the world. Gibbon calls them the two magic pillars of the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the popes. They aided in raising the spiritual above the temporal power, in removing clerics from the jurisdiction of secular courts and in securing to the bishops of Rome a supremacy over all other bishops. They effectually broke down all opposition, secular and religious, and, in the end, helped to create the dogma of the infallibility of the pope.

The result may be seen in the extraordinary power wielded by the popes in the middle ages. The kingdom of England was placed under an interdict, subjects were absolved from their allegiance to their sovereign, the king was personally excommunicated and finally was deposed and King John, after several years of resistance, was reduced to the necessity of resigning his crown to the papal legate and of receiving it back as a vassal of the pope. The haughty and powerful Philip Augustus, King of France, was humbled in like manner. And King Henry, of Germany, was compelled to go to Canosa. In a dreary winter season, with the ground deep in snow, with every mark of royalty laid aside, barefooted, clad only in the long white linen dress of the penitent, he waited three days at the door of the castle before the pope would condescend to restore him his crown. One of the main buttresses

of that almost unlimited power were these forged documents, because they silenced all opposition by seeming to carry back that usurped authority to the earliest ages of the church.

Bishop Fallon is reported by the Boston Herald to have said at a missionary congress, "What does this movement mean? It means that we propose to make this continent Catholic." This perhaps explains his arrogant claim to pose as a censor of the pulpits of the city. He may look to time-serving politicians to kowtow to him, but not to ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It may explain his piteous wail: "Why do they not leave us alone?" as if he meant to spend the rest of his days in rapt meditation on the glories of Mary, in a quietude like that of a Trappist monastery. And in the same breath he announces a series of Lenten controversial sermons in which he assails Protestantism in general and Luther, Knox and Henry VIII. in particular. It reminds one of the gentle German hacking his way through Belgium, whining all the way because he is driven to withstand the unprovoked attacks of England and France.

To make this continent Roman Catholic means something. It may mean to reduce it to the low level of South America, in education, morals and religion, and as Rome is always the same—semper eadem—Bishop Fallon may be looking wistfully to the day when the pope may be able to place the dominions of the King of England under an interdict, and compel the President of the United States to go to Canosa. With all the lessons of history before us, if we play into his hands, as so many are only too ready to do, we shall richly deserve our fate.

I must leave to the Church of Rome the pitiful distinction of having perpetrated "the greatest aberration in the history of Christendom" and the greatest fraud and imposture in the history of the world.

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, March 28th, 1919.

BISHOP FALLON BIDS FAREWELL TO CANON TUCKER

Editor of The Free Press: It is not my fault if Canon Tucker, in following his friends Dr. Blakeney and the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, digged a pit into which his own feet have stumbled. A man who rests his case on such authorities must abide by the consequences. I realize that the Canon's position is humiliating; but it is not of my making. I am not

responsible for his pawnshop scholarship; but, if it relieves his feelings, I have no serious objection to be the target of so angry and flustered a marksman whose weapons are so antiquated and so obsolete. The Canon is now engaged, to use an expressive Americanism, in "shooting up the whole landscape" from Boston to Brazil, in the hope of inflicting some damage, somehow, somewhere, on Catholics. Even without the evidence of his last letters it would be an easy guess that the Canon was perturbed. To be caught in the company of either the "spurious" Blakeney or of that common pedlar of "papable forgery and coarse fraud," the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, would in itself be sufficiently disconcerting; but to be detected consorting with both of them at once might well make even a less sensitive controversialist than the Canon feel uncomfortable and unclean. He should have profited by the wisdom of my philosophic fellow-idolater, Artemus Ward : "It is not so much the things we don't know that makes us ridiculous, as knowing so many things that ain't so." Samuel Pickwick, Esq., president of the Pickwick Club, enjoyed a bubble reputation as an antiquarian until it was shown that the cryptic inscription on his famous discovery was simply "Bil Stumps, His Mark."

Canon Tucker is no mean rival of Mr. Pickwick, as the facts establish.

On February 16, Canon Tucker said, on the authority of Dr. Blakeney, "St. Bonaventure, called the seraphic doctor, published a Psalter of the Virgin." At that time Dr. Blakeney was, in the words of Canon Tucker, "an eminent theologian." Later on he was styled "an accurate and serious writer." But the eminence, accuracy and seriousness of Dr. Blakeney were knocked into the proverbial cocked hat when it became known that the British Museum Catalogue described the work cited by him as "spurious."

On St. Patrick's Day, happy omen! with a flourish of trumpets Canon Tucker paraded on the local stage another of his favorites. This time it was the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom the Canon vouched for as a "serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world to-day." Speer's specialty was the vilification of the Catholics of the whole South American continent—no small undertaking; and incidentally, the collection of funds from the gullible dupes of his falsehoods—an easier and more profitable operation. But Speer's reliability was seriously impaired when it was disclosed that he had offered as proofs of his slanders two forged documents, one a bogus encyclical attributed to Pope

Leo XIII. and the other a counterfeit pastoral of the Archbishop of Santiago. It is not an enviable position for this "outstanding figure in the religious world," nor for his London sponsor. Canon Tucker now unblushingly admits that the documents were forgeries, but declares that Dr. Speer used them "in all good faith, thinking they were genuine." To be sure! Such is the defence of every slander-hawker when he is found out. But the point to be kept in mind is that Speer was found out, and that he did not announce the discovery himself. The whole correspondence was published by the Rev. Father Martin, of Cleveland, who, after following Speer relentlessly for more than two years, finally forced him to admit that the documents in question were forgeries. With a delicate consideration for the forger, Speer did not disclose his name: "At his request I keep his name secret." He even went the length of intensifying his offense and further stultifying himself, by offering the testimony of the undisclosed forger in a final effort to substantiate his calumnies. "The author of the letter" (that is the forger), "claims that the statements are all true, even to-day." It is impossible to fittingly qualify such conduct.

And such are Canon Tucker's authorities! Oh! Geordie, jingling Geordie, it is grand to hear "spurious" Blakeney laying down the guilt of Catholic idolatry, and "good faith" Speer lecturing on the turpitude of South Americans, and all the while Canon Tucker waves his hat from the wings.

Canon Tucker declares that I have admitted that "there is such a book as the Psalter of the Virgin." That assertion, like so many others of Canon Tucker, is at direct variance with the facts. I have not at any time either admitted or denied the existence of "the Psalter of the Virgin." I know nothing of it; I have never seen it; I have failed in my search for it. It may exist. It may have been written by Titus Oates, or Dr. Blakeney, or Maria Monk, or the Rev. Robt. E. Speer, or Horatio Hocken, or Canon Tucker. But, used as it has been by the rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, it is "spurious." And that is a somewhat damaging fact.

But I have come across a Psalter that has aroused my curiosity. It is to be found in Canon Tucker's own "Book of Common Prayer," in a service appointed in the Church of England for June 20, the anniversary of the accession of the late Queen Victoria. In that service the name of the Queen is substituted in more than half a dozen psalms. Thus it would seem that what is quite appropriate in the case of the

Queen of England becomes rank idolatry when applied to the Queen of Heaven!

Canon Tucker's horror suffocates him as he writes of Catholic "worship" of the Blessed Virgin Mary. What of the foul idolatry approved by the "Book of Common Prayer," when, in the marriage service, it directs the husband to say to the wife: "With my body I thee worship?"

Canon Tucker is shocked to the innermost fibre of his spiritual being by some of the terms of devotion, which he declares Catholics address to the Virgin Mary. What will he say of the dedication of the Approved Protestant Version of the Bible, wherein Queen Elizabeth is styled "that bright Occidental Star," where King James is likened to the Sun and is described as "that Sanctified Person, who, under God, is the immediate author of all their (his subjects) true happiness?"

And now I beg leave to bid a definite, if not a very respectful, farewell to Canon Tucker and his blind, blundering guides, Blakeney and Speer. In doing so I desire to express the conviction that many devout Anglicans, who love the Mother of God and pray to her, will not thank Canon Tucker for his attempt to throw obloquy upon that devotion. Nor are they apt to follow him in his unjustifiable accusation that Catholics are idolators. Rather will they approve the words of Dean Stanley: "Let us never impute to our opponents intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names, which they themselves repudiate."

And it is Sydney Smith who wrote: "The more dirt, the less hurt."

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, April 1st, 1919.

Some Correspondence

The London Advertiser of Dec. 5, 1916, published an interview with Canon Tucker, of which the following passage is an extract :

"Bishop Fallon a year ago announced there was no salvation for anyone outside the Romish church, and later turned around and tried to explain. It is just as well Protestants should understand this position; then there will be less kowtowing to the Roman Catholic Church."

This gratuitous and false statement led to some private correspondence between Bishop Fallon and Canon Tucker. This correspondence is now published herewith for the reason that, in his letter of March 10, 1919, Canon Tucker garbled its contents and distorted its meaning.

London, Ont., Dec. 6, 1916.

The Rev. Canon Tucker,
City.

Rev. Dear Sir :

The London Advertiser of the 5th inst., quotes you as authority for the following statement :

"Bishop Fallon a year ago announced there was no salvation for anyone outside the Romish church, and later turned around and tried to explain. It is just as well Protestants should understand this position; then there will be less kowtowing to the Roman Catholic Church."

I have no remembrance of ever having made such an announcement, and, consequently, no recollection of having later tried to explain it. I write to inquire when and where I used the language you attribute to me.

I am, Rev. Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

London, Ont., Dec. 11, 1916.

Rev. Canon Tucker,
City.

Rev. Dear Sir :

On the 6th inst. I wrote you as follows :

(Refer to letter of the 6th inst.)

Not having received a reply, I assume that my letter must have gone astray. I am now confiding it to the registered mail.

I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

The Rectory,
St. Paul's Cathedral,
London, Ont., Dec. 13, 1916.

The Right Reverend
Bishop Fallon,—

My Lord :

I regret extremely the delay in answering your letter of Dec. 6th, which was due to pressure of work and which occasioned the writing of your second letter.

The item in the London Advertiser, from which you quote, was the result of an interview over the telephone. I am not responsible for the wording of the report.

You ask me when and where you used the language I attribute to you. If by language is meant the form of words I can only say that I attributed no language to you because I had not your words before me and only spoke from memory. The impression I meant to convey, however, I received from a sermon preached by your Lordship in your Cathedral, I think, a year or more ago, the date I cannot recall even approximately. The sermon was reported* in the Free Press, I believe, and gave rise to a good deal of comment at the time. This will probably recall the occasion to your Lordship.

I am, with great respect,

Yours most truly,

L. NORMAN TUCKER

* Canon Tucker was seen consulting the files of the Free Press. But he found no justification for his statement.

London, Ont., Dec. 14, 1916.

Rev. Canon Tucker,
City.

Rev. Dear Sir :

I am in receipt of your letter of the 13th inst.

Though the statement to which I drew your attention is printed by the London Advertiser within quotation marks, and therefore on its face appears to the public as your exact language, I accept without reserve your denial of responsibility for the wording of the report. Nevertheless a great wrong has been done me. In view of this fact, and because I have never given utterance to a sentiment so abhorrent to myself and so foreign to the teaching of the Catholic Church, I ask if you do not feel that some public repudiation is due me by you of the words quoted with your name and authority, and which gave utterance to a thought that not only have I never held, but that could not be entertained by anyone familiar with Catholic doctrine.

I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

The Rectory,
St. Paul's Cathedral,
London, Ont., Dec. 17, 1916.

My Lord:

I have been in bed for three days unable to attend to business.

In reply to your letter of Dec. 14th I would say that I fully accept your Lordship's assurance and shall take the earliest opportunity of saying so publicly.

This, however, leaves me in some perplexity. What you disavow so strongly has been familiar to me, as a commonplace, in the Province of Quebec. As a boy, living in that Province, I attended a French school, in which the pupils were taught, under the sanction of the Roman Catholic Church :— "hors de l'eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine il n'y a pas de salut" (Outside the Church Catholic, Apostolic and Roman, there is no salvation), and as a resident of that Province for many years, in town and country, I never found that formula repudiated.

I am, with deep respect,
Yours most truly,
L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, Ont., Dec. 19, 1916.

Rev. Canon Tucker,
City.

Rev. Dear Sir :

I beg leave to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, and to express my appreciation of the fair-mindedness of your decision to publicly disassociate me from the objectionable and incorrect statement published in the London Advertiser.

I have never met the formula: "Outside the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church there is no salvation," in any manual of Catholic doctrine. With the axiom "outside the Church there is no salvation," I am of course quite familiar. Like all other axiomatic expressions, "the King can do no wrong" for instance, it must be explained. "Outside the Church there is no salvation," and "he who believeth not shall be condemned" are identical propositions. Both are susceptible of, and have at times received, a false interpretation; but, rightly understood and correctly explained, each is an undeniable Christian truth.

I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
✠ M. F. FALLON,
Bishop of London.

The Rectory, St. Paul's Cathedral,
London, Ont., Dec. 28, 1916.

The Right Reverend
Bishop Fallon,—

My Lord :

I am sending you herewith two Catechisms, which contain, in the form of question and answer, the formula to which I referred in my last letter to you. You will find it at p. 27 in the blue book and at p. p. 27 and VII. in the other.

With you Lordship's explanation of the general expression "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" ("outside the Church, no salvation") I am in perfect accord. I dissent only when the word ecclesia (church) is restricted in meaning, as in these Catechisms. After a residence of nearly forty years in the Province of Quebec, during, which, as far as I know, this was the unquestioned teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, I am perhaps too prone to interpret in that restricted sense even the general expressions when used by representatives of that Church. It is a real satisfaction to me to find that these are not your Lordship's views.

In conclusion, I cannot suppress a note of inquiry. In your letter of Dec. 14th, you say that this sentiment is not only "abhorrent to yourself," which I can readily understand, but also that it is "utterly foreign to the teaching of the Catholic Church" and "a thought that could not be entertained by anyone familiar with Catholic doctrine." How then could it have been issued by the Church Authorities in Council Assembled in the Province of Quebec ?

I am, with great respect,

Yours most truly,

L. NORMAN TUCKER.

London, Ont., Dec. 31, 1916.

The Rev. Canon Tucker,
City.

Rev. Dear Sir :

I am in receipt of your letter of the 28th inst. In reply I desire to fix the chronological order of our correspondence. On December 5th, the London Advertiser stated that "Bishop Fallon a year ago announced that there was no salvation for anyone outside the Roman Church." Because this declaration applied the doctrine of exclusive salvation to any and every individual ("anyone") who happened to be outside the visible communion of the Church of Rome, I wrote of it, on December 14th, as "abhorrent to myself," "utterly foreign to the teaching of the Catholic Church" and "could not be entertained by anyone familiar with Catholic doctrine." I did not use this language concerning the formula, "Hors de l'eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine il n'y a pas de salut," ("outside the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, there is no salvation,") which you drew to my attention in your letter of December 17th, and of which I merely stated on the 19th, "I have never met the formula in any manual of Catholic Doctrine." My reason for assuming that it would not be found in a "Manual" lies in the fact that it calls for such explanation as might be looked for only in a theological treatise; though, of course, in Catholic teaching, "Hors de l'eglise il n'y a point de salut" and "Hors de l'eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine, il n'y a pas de salut" are again identical propositions, the epithets "catholique, apostolique et romaine" being simply determinative of "eglise" (church).

Now, our objection is taken not to the statement of our doctrine in its definite form, but to its application to individuals instead of to a system, and to the habit of making no

account of the official explanations of this dogma offered by the Church which has formulated it. The Catholic Church does not apply the doctrine of exclusive salvation to any individual person; by it she condemns systems and declares that they exclude from Heaven. Bear with me while I explain.

The axiom, "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus" (outside the Church there is no salvation"), is accepted equally by both of us, for in your letter of the 28th inst, you say : "With your Lordship's explanation of the general expression—extra ecclesiam, etc. ("outside the Church, etc."), I am in perfect accord." The question necessarily arises at once : "What do we mean by ecclesia (church) ?" for we are both equally damnatory of something. My answer is plain, decisive and intelligible. By "ecclesia" (church) I mean "The Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church," and I necessarily condemn every other religious system. But I do not condemn every, or any, individual. Of that, more in a moment.

Now what do you mean by "Ecclesia" ? (church) Does the term include and embrace the Unitarian, the Methodist, the Congregational, the Universalist, the Baptist, equally with the Anglican ? Do you include equally Cronyn Memorial Church and St. Paul's Cathedral, in as far as the doctrines taught in them are the measure ? For you must fix a standard, clear, definite and practical; and the moment you fix a standard, you assert "Outside the (standard) Church there is no salvation," and this, once more, is an identical proposition with "Outside the (Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic) Church there is no salvation." But it would be unfair and unjust to assume, unless you asserted it, and particularly if you asserted the contrary, that you damned every, or any, individual who was outside your Standard Church.

What, then, is the teaching of the Catholic Church as regards the individual outside her visible fold ? Once more, it is plain, clear, and definite. She says that he may be saved through baptism, even implicitly by desire, provided he observe the natural law according to a right conscience, commit no grevious sin, or, having committed it, be forgiven by God through perfect contrition. At the same time she asserts emphatically that the difficulty of salvation is immeasurably increased by the lack of the aids and helps found in her divinely-established system. And she applies the same principle from this lowest position that the individual can occupy relative to revealed religion, up through the ascending grades to the most complete acceptance of Christianity. Everywhere, however, and at all times, and in regard of every individual, she pro-

claims the necessity of "good faith," and declares that whoever finds this "good faith" impaired by doubt, uncertainty, or disbelief, is bound, under penalty of the loss of salvation, to adopt all possible and reasonable means of restoring so absolutely necessary a foundation. "Invincible ignorance"—an offensive-looking phrase that were better rendered "inculpable lack of knowledge"—will excuse, but it must be "inculpable." Let me illustrate by a striking example. John Henry Newman was about forty-five years of age when he joined the visible Communion of the Roman Catholic Church. Up to that time his life had been spent in the study of the doctrines of Christianity and of the writings of the Fathers, and in the contemplation of things spiritual. Doubt came to him. In the event he entered the Roman Catholic Church. Though one of the most remarkable intellects of modern times, and most widely read in ecclesiastical learning, he was in "invincible ignorance" of the position and claims of the Roman Catholic Church until his first uncertainty arose. And yet he had written and spoken much against her. When he lost his "good faith," had he not taken all possible and reasonable means of re-establishing it, there would have been room for the application—though even then, only theoretically—of the principle of exclusive salvation. For the condemnation of the individual remains always in the sole domain of Almighty God.

I have written at great length. But I have wished to state our position clearly.

I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

✠ M. F. FALLON,

Bishop of London.

To the above letter no reply was received. But on Dec. 18, 1916, Canon Tucker addressed a communication to the London Advertiser, containing the following passage :

"In an interview with The Advertiser I recalled a sermon preached by His Lordship Bishop Fallon, a year or two ago, which created a sensation at the time because it seemed to give the impression "outside the Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation." I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Bishop, and yet I must admit that the sermon made that impression on me. Now the Bishop states emphatically that he never gave utterance to any such sentiment. I need only say that I fully accept the Bishop's assurance and regret extremely if I misunderstood his words."